



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search


Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>







600094412Q





600094412Q





MESSIAH THE PRINCE.

MESSIAH THE PRINCE

OR

THE INSPIRATION OF THE PROPHECIES OF DANIEL.

CONTAINING

REMARKS ON THE VIEWS OF DR. PUSEY, MR. DESPREZ,
AND DR. WILLIAMS,
CONCERNING THE BOOK OF DANIEL.

TOGETHER WITH

A Treatise on the Sabbatical Years and Jubilees.

BY

J. W. BOSANQUET, F.R.A.S.


"Art thou He that should come, or do we look for another?"

"I adjure thee by the living God, that thou tell us whether thou be the Christ, the Son of God. Jesus saith unto him, Thou hast said : nevertheless I say unto you, Hereafter shall ye see the Son of Man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven."

LONDON :

LONGMANS, GREEN, READER, AND DYER,
PATERNOSTER ROW.

1866.



101. e. 92.



LONDON:
STRANGEWAYS & WALDEN, Printers,
Castle St. Leicester Sq.

Dedicated

TO

OUR BRETHREN OF THE SEED OF ABRAHAM
IN THE FLESH,


"THE PEOPLE OF THE SAINTS OF THE MOST HIGH,"

THE INHERITORS OF

"THE KINGDOM" WHICH "SHALL NOT BE LEFT TO OTHER PEOPLE."

"Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made."

"And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise."—Gal. iii. 16, 29.



INTRODUCTION.

THE following remarks upon the book of Daniel, written during leisure hours of a busy life, were begun with the intention merely of commenting upon two of the principal prophecies of the book; with the view, first, of pointing out the untenableness of Dr. Pusey's interpretation of the well-known prophecy of the ninth chapter, and secondly, of arguing from the exact and literal fulfilment in Jesus Christ, of the words of that chapter, and also from the remarkable historical fulfilment of the words of chapter two, for the genuineness and inspiration of this most sublime and marvellous book of Holy Scripture. While the work, however, was in progress through the press, the publication of Mr. Desprez's treatise on "Daniel, or the Apocalypse of the Old Testament," accompanied by an Introduction from the hand of Dr. Williams, in which the prophecy of the ninth chapter is ingeniously, and at first sight inextricably, interwoven with certain portions of the eleventh chapter, now commonly supposed to have been written in the time of the Maccabees, rendered it necessary to take into consideration additional matter, and to extend the range of these remarks over a more comprehensive field. The result has been, that some observations which might more properly have formed part of the body of the work, as now written, have been omitted, and can only be supplied in the form of prefatory matter; for which deficiency in arrangement the author craves the indulgence of the reader.

The delay thus occasioned has afforded him the advantage of perusing several recent comments on Dr. Pusey's admirable

work on "Daniel the Prophet," especially the valuable observations of Mr. J. J. Stewart Perowne, concerning the Chaldee of Daniel, published in the first number of the "Contemporary Review," to which he begs leave to direct the attention of those who are desirous of entering into the linguistic argument. All the arguments which the learning and ingenuity of adverse critics can deduce from the language of the book, with the view of lowering the date of its composition within times subsequent to the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes, have now probably been exhausted; and the result of the discussion of this part of the inquiry has been, we are satisfied, to establish with increased clearness, in the mind of every unprejudiced examiner, the peculiar appropriateness of the prophet's language to the position in which he was placed, viz.,—at Babylon; and also its close approximation to the language known to have been used about the time of the Captivity, when Daniel professes to have written. On the other hand, the peculiarity of the construction of the book, in successive portions of Hebrew, Chaldee, and Hebrew, and the occasional alternations from the first to the third, and from the third again to the first person, in the composition, seem to favour the idea that all portions of the present text are not the production of the same hand, and lead to the inference, that the dignified and majestic prophecies of Daniel are of an older date than certain dubious passages contained in the book, which seem to betray the hand of a compiler even as late as the time of the Maccabees. Notwithstanding all that has been written concerning the book of Daniel, we submit, that it is yet open to more searching examination: and much yet remains to be brought forward towards fixing with precision the date of some of the principal visions, as also towards re-establishing the lofty position, in the scheme of Divine Revelation, which the writings of this prophet are entitled and destined in our opinion yet to hold. It has not yet been determined by the consent of commentators, under what Median or Medo-Persian king Daniel lived and wrote his later prophecies, that is to say, who was the king in secular history that in the book of Daniel bears no other title than Darius, whose dominions extended over a vast

portion of the Persian empire, and who unquestionably lived within the times of authentic Persian history. So long as this preliminary and fundamental question remains undecided, we question the ability of any commentator to do entire justice to the book of Daniel; and we most certainly deny the competency of any critic to infer, from the silence of those prophets who lived after the Captivity concerning Daniel and his writings, that neither the prophet nor his writings were in existence in their days; when, for aught that can be shown to the contrary, Daniel may have been living contemporaneously with those prophets, and indeed, have been composing some of his later prophecies at Babylon, at the very time when they themselves were delivering their divine messages to the people at Jerusalem. Dr. Pusey has fairly abandoned all hope of throwing light upon this important historical question, and together with most modern interpreters, rests satisfied with the improbable and uncritical suggestion, that the Darius of Daniel may possibly be identified either with the Astyages of Herodotus, or the Cyaxares of Xenophon, or with some yet undiscovered king of Media. On the other hand, we affirm, without fear of error, and one of the chief objects of the following pages will be to show, that Daniel's master was no other than the great Persian king, Darius, son of Hystaspes, one of the best known kings of Persian history; and that one of the most important of Daniel's visions, viz., that of the ninth chapter, is fixed with precision to the year in which that king had attained the sixty-second year of his age, that is, B.C. 592. So that the chronology of the book of Daniel, if we are correct, so far from remaining the most vague and disputable of all the books of Scripture, will thus become more accurately fixed than that of any other book: while the lives of three of the chief actors in the history, viz., of Daniel, Belshazzar, and Darius, will be brought down within times when the chief "president" of the kingdom of Darius might possibly have been employed, as he tells us that he was employed, in transacting "the king's business" in the capital of the Persian empire, that is, at Susa, which could not well have been the case at any time before the conquest of Babylon by the Persians.

The principal objections raised against the genuineness and inspiration of the book of Daniel, are comprised under the following heads:—1st. That it is written partly in Chaldee, or Aramaic, and partly in Hebrew. 2nd. That it is placed in Hebrew Bibles, not amongst the prophets, but amongst the Hagiographa, or sacred writings. 3rd. That the author's language is interspersed with Greek and Persian words. 4th. That "neither Zechariah nor Haggai, following immediately the return from exile, contain any such allusion to Daniel or his book, as a career so marvellous, and a book so significant, if they had been known, would have rendered natural, if not necessary."* 5th. That the silence of Ezra, Nehemiah, and Jesus, son of Sirach, concerning the book, is tantamount to its exclusion from the Canon. 6th. That the vision of the eleventh chapter comprehends a series of minute historical events, unlike the character of the predictions of any other prophet, and indeed of Daniel himself, ranging over a period of one hundred years, and then suddenly and abruptly terminating in the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes. 7th. That historical and chronological statements throughout the book are irreconcilable with known secular history.

Now considering that Daniel was resident at Babylon, in the midst of the great stream of commerce flowing to and fro between Greece and Persia, we can see no force whatever in the objection to the authenticity of his writings derived from the occasional use of Greek and Persian words. On the contrary, the use of such words, as argued convincingly by Dr. Pusey and Mr. Perowne, forms one of the most satisfactory proofs of their composition at the time and in the place in which they profess to have been written. While the fact that the book professes to be the production of one of Hebrew descent, living within the metropolis of the Chaldees, sufficiently and satisfactorily accounts for the use of both Chaldee and Hebrew by the same writer. Even Dr. Williams himself seems to be less positive, and places less stress upon the linguistic argument, in his Introduction to Mr.

* Dr. WILLIAMS's Introduction, p. xii.

Desprez, than in his original Essay on Bunsen's Biblical Researches.

With regard to the position of the book of Daniel amongst the books of the Hagiographa, though we think that there is every reason to be satisfied that the writings of Daniel must have been known to, and received by, the Jewish church, from very early times after the return from Babylon, and accepting also the tradition of the Talmud as probable, that the authority of Daniel, though absent, was, together with that of Ezra, of influence amongst the members of the "Great Synagogue," in the settlement of the Canon of Scripture after the return; yet we can perceive no sufficient reason for believing that either Daniel or Ezra, during their lives, had finally closed and determined the contents of the books which bear their names, in the fragmentary form in which they have come down to us, or that they were accepted by the church from the time of Ezra, as of the same weight and authority as the books of the prophets who immediately preceded Daniel, viz., Jeremiah and Ezekiel. The arguments of Dr. Pusey upon this point appear to us to be far from convincing. The evidence, indeed, seems decidedly to tend the other way. The apocryphal additions which had been attached to both of these books before the time of their translation into Greek, tend to establish that the limit of the contents of neither of them was then absolutely fixed, while from the book of Ecclesiasticus, we gather distinctly, that by some at least of the Jewish church, neither Daniel nor Ezra was reckoned amongst those spoken of by the son of Sirach, as "renowned for their power, giving counsel by their understanding, and declaring prophecies."* We see no reason, therefore, for believing that these books were generally received by the Jews of the first few centuries after the exile, otherwise than as writings worthy of deep study and contemplation, and placed by them therefore amongst the Hagiographa. And we submit that it is only by the admission of the truth of this position, that the upholders of the authenticity of the book of Daniel can be extricated

* Ecclus. xliv. 3.

from the untenable position in which they are placed, as regards the questionable portion of one of the later chapters. The revelations of Daniel were probably looked upon by the Jews for many years after the reception of them at Jerusalem, much in the same manner as the Revelations of St. John were looked upon in the early Christian Church, concerning the latter of which, Eusebius, in the fourth century, while enumerating the canonical books of the New Testament, after naming the first epistle of Peter as authentic, adds, "Then is to be placed, if you think good, the Revelation of St. John."*

The prophecies of Daniel, like those of St. John, must for several hundred years after their delivery, have been wholly unintelligible by those who read them: and as professing to relate to the times of "the latter days" of the Jewish nation, may naturally have remained neglected and unheeded, till the time when to all appearance they were literally coming to pass. It is the exact fulfilment of the words of both these books of revelation, now so plainly perceived after the event, which alone has stamped them with the mark of divine inspiration, never to be effaced.

With regard to the argument drawn from the silence of writers living immediately after the Captivity, concerning Daniel and his writings, it appears to us to be extremely weak and worthless. What reasonable ground, we ask, can there be for expecting to find amongst the meagre fragments of history which constitute the books of Ezra and Nehemiah, any reference to Daniel, who was at Babylon, when so little is recorded concerning the acts of the leaders who had brought up the Captivity to Jerusalem? And if we are correct in our identification of the Darius of Daniel with the Darius of the books of Haggai and Zechariah, there can be no ground for the assumption that the two prophets writing at Jerusalem, in the second and fourth years of that king's reign, should "necessarily" make reference to the visions of Daniel, who was writing in a distant place in the first and third years of the same king. We accept, however, to the fullest extent, the

* Euseb. Eccles. Hist. iii. 25.

force of the argument derived from the silence of Jesus, son of Sirach. There were clearly living in his days, as we have already said, those who did not accept the authority of the book of Daniel. And if we will consider for a moment, it could hardly have been otherwise. For how is it conceivable, that the sect of the Sadducees, which we know to have been in existence before the days of the son of Sirach, could have maintained its powerful influence amongst the educated classes of the people, believing neither in angel, nor in spirit, nor in the doctrine of the resurrection from the grave, in the face of the book of Daniel—the very text-book of these Pharisaic opinions,—if the book had at that time been generally considered of binding authority? Dean Milman has eloquently written, “I have no doubt that in one of the noblest books among those called the Apocryphal, we have the work of a Sadducee, or rather, for it is a manifest fusion of several books, a full declaration of the views of the higher Sadducaic anti-traditional party. In the book of Ecclesiasticus there are magnificent descriptions of God’s creative power, of His all-comprehending providence, of His chastisement of unrighteousness, of His rewards of godliness; the most beautiful precepts of moral and social virtue, of worldly wisdom and sagacity, of chastity, temperance, justice, beneficence, but”—“as to angels, in the whole book there is no word recognising any intermediate beings between God and man.”* There is indeed one allusion to the doctrine of the immortality of the soul,† a doctrine then also entertained by most heathen philosophers, but not one word on the doctrine of the resurrection, such as it was afterwards preached by Paul, exemplified by Jesus, scoffed at by the Athenians, and as it is so plainly taught in the last chapter of Daniel. Thus then there appears to be quite sufficient reason for the omission of any allusion to Daniel in the book of Ecclesiasticus, without being driven to the conclusion that Daniel’s writings were not

* Milman’s *History of the Jews*, vol. ii. 32.

† *Eccclus. xix. 19.* Dean Milman appears inadvertently to have spoken of the doctrine of immortality as not entertained by the son of Sirach, intending probably to have spoken of the resurrection of the body.

known and revered by many in the days of the writer of that book. That they were deeply studied, and held up both for example and precept, long before the days of Jesus, son of Sirach, we have the direct testimony of a book derived from another influential sect, viz., from the Apocryphal book called the First of Maccabees, the tendency of which is decidedly of a Pharisaic character. For there we learn that Mattathias, the father of Judas Maccabeus, on his death-bed held up for example the lives of Ananias, Azarias, Misael, and Daniel; and, from the second book bearing that title, that the doctrine of the resurrection from the dead, taught only explicitly in the book of Daniel, and which, as we believe, was a doctrine first promulgated by Daniel in the college of philosophers at Babylon, had at that time taken such strong hold upon the minds of the Jewish people, as to have sustained the courage of seven brethren, together with their mother, in the presence of Antiochus, when they chose rather to suffer the penalty of death, than to renounce their religion, trusting, as they declared, "that the King of the world shall raise us up, who have died for His laws, unto everlasting life."* Except for the words of Dan. xii. 2, the belief of these seven young men can only be accounted for by inspiration. We agree then with the objectors, that the book of Daniel was originally placed where we now find it in the Hebrew Scriptures, amongst the Hagiographa; and moreover that by many it could not have been accepted as of authority even as late as the time of Christ. But we see no sufficient reason to be derived from thence, for entertaining the idea of its having been composed so late as the time of the Maccabees. On the contrary, in our opinion the positive evidence of the books of Maccabees in favour of the reception of the book before the days of Antiochus, far outweighs any negative evidence to be derived from the omission to mention it in the book of Ecclesiasticus.

Such, then, is the mode in which we satisfy our own minds with regard to the first five of the above-enumerated objections. Taken all together, they appear to weigh as nothing

* 2 Macc. vii. 9.

against the simple affirmation of the book itself, that it was written from time to time by Daniel, during the reigns of Nebuchadnezzar, Belshazzar, and Darius, the Median king.

We now come to the consideration of the sixth and seventh objections, which are of an historical character. And here we approach the stronghold of the opponents of the authenticity of our book. It is the strong conviction in the minds of acute and well-trained critics that they are substantially right in their historical criticisms, which excludes the possibility of their entering with patience into argument with those who meet them dogmatically with the plenary inspiration of Holy Scripture. While, on the other hand, the inextinguishable feeling that the book cannot have been the mere work of man—that the unity of Scripture is imperfect without the book of Daniel—that to expunge it from the Bible is, as it were, to abstract the very heart of the scheme of Divine revelation to mankind—as strongly disinclines the supporters of the authenticity from listening to any argument which touches the veracity of any portion of the book.

Nevertheless we humbly submit that the truth and pre-eminent value of the book will become more firmly established by the surrender of some small portion of the present text, which, we shall endeavour to show, is not necessarily to be taken as proceeding from the hand of Daniel. We beg the particular attention of the reader while we offer some few prefatory remarks, pointing out what we conceive to be the key, not only to the historical difficulties involved in the book of Daniel, but the key also to many discrepancies of a similar nature which pervade the history of the Jews from the time of Solomon to the birth of Christ.

If we turn to the first verse of the tenth chapter of Daniel, we read, "*In the third year of Cyrus, king of Persia, a thing was revealed unto Daniel, whose name was called Belteshazzar : and the thing (was) true, but the time appointed (was) long ; and he understood the thing, and had understanding of the vision.*" It will be observed, that by the reception or rejection of this one single verse, not only the chronology of the book of Daniel, but the chronology of the whole Jewish monarchy and up-

wards, may be very materially altered. For if, as we are here told, the vision of the tenth and following chapters was seen in the third year of the reign of Cyrus, and in the course of the vision Darius the Mede is incidentally mentioned as having already reigned, it is clear that Darius the Mede must have reigned before the third of Cyrus. This, then, is the inference which has been invariably drawn from the passage. On the other hand, if that one verse is omitted, on the assumption that it was not written by the hand of Daniel, the vision then opens with the words: "In those days I Daniel was mourning three full weeks;" and "those days" must clearly signify the days referred to in the previous chapter, ix. 1,—that is to say, to the early days of Darius, son of Ahasuerus; and the question then remains open for consideration, whether this Darius reigned before or after Cyrus. Now, except for the evidence of this one particular verse, there could be no question as to the time when Darius reigned. For Daniel himself has informed us that it was at the expiration of "seventy years," counted from the desolation of Jerusalem (ix. 2), that Darius began to reign at Babylon; and the prophet Zechariah informs us (i. 12) that "seventy years of indignation" had been completed upon Jerusalem in the second year of Darius, son of Hystaspes. So that a presumption is thus created that the first verse of chapter x. may be merely the interpolation of some pious interpreter, inserted possibly with the object of raising the chronology of the reign of Darius at Babylon to the extent of not less than forty-six years—that is to say, of raising the first year of this king as "set over the realm of the Chaldeans," at the age of sixty-two, from B.C. 492, to B.C. 538.

Now, if we examine the passage, we find much reason for concluding that this verse was not written by the hand of Daniel. In the first place, it speaks of the prophet in the third person, and informs us of what we already knew, from Daniel himself, that his Chaldean name was Belteshazzar. It reads also at first sight as if it were merely an introductory heading to the vision, much in the same manner as we read the introductory heading to Psalm vii.: "Shiggaion of David,

which he sang unto the Lord, concerning the words of Cush the Benjamite," which words we need not necessarily suppose to have been written by king David himself. The writer then proceeds to say that "a thing was revealed unto Daniel," speaking of the prophet in the third person, and immediately adds,—*Veēmeth haddavar*, "And the thing is true." Now no one could be qualified to make this assertion till after the fulfilment, or the supposed fulfilment, of the vision had taken place; for Daniel expressly informs us that he "understood not"—and that "the words were *closed up and sealed* until the time of the end," xii. 8, 9. The translation of the verse is not correctly given in the English version, and we prefer to follow more nearly that of Rosenmüller,* who has no bias towards the view we are suggesting. The writer goes on to say,—*Vetsaba gadol*, "It concerns great warfare," or a great army.† *Ubin eth haddavar*, "Consider, therefore, the thing,"—*Ubinah lo bammareh*, "And have understanding of it in the vision." These latter words are not at first sight intelligible. What does the writer mean by understanding it in the vision? We submit that the writer here informs us that he is about to offer an explanation in the form of vision of the thing revealed, which he has just declared to be true. We shall return to this. At present we are upon the chronology of the chapter. Now we think that we have evidence in Scripture both as to how, and why, this alteration in the chronology of the book of Daniel should have been introduced by the sacred Scribe.

It is a remarkable fact that two different versions of the history of the Jews under Cyrus and Darius have come down to us—one contained in the canonical book of Ezra, the other in the apocryphal book of Esdras; and, what is still more remarkable is, that Josephus has adopted the arrangement of the apocryphal book. The book of Ezra places the register of those who came up to Jerusalem with Zerubbabel, Mordecai,

* "Anno Cyri, Persarum regis, tertio res patefacta est Danieli, qui Beltschazzar nominatus est, eaque vera, et magnorum bellorum. Igitur attende illam, attende, inquam illam per visionem patefactam."

† καὶ δύναμις μεγάλη—Theodotion.

and others, in the reign of Cyrus; the apocryphal book and Josephus place it in the reign of Darius. The book of Ezra records an opposition on the part of the Samaritans to the building of the temple in the reign of Cyrus, while the apocryphal book and Josephus place the same act of opposition in the reign of Darius. Here, then, we meet with very early evidences of historical uncertainty with reference to the events of Jewish history under these two reigns. Whichever of the two versions may be the true one, it is unquestionable that, according to the canonical book of Ezra itself, both in the *third year of Cyrus*, and again about the *third year of Darius*, son of Hystaspes (Ezra, v. 3-17), direct hindrance was offered by the Samaritans to the Jews while building the foundations of the temple. Now it is generally assumed by interpreters, both ancient and modern, that the cause of Daniel's mourning for "three full weeks," when the prince of the kingdom of Persia withstood him "one-and-twenty days," was connected with some contest carried on at the court of Persia, concerning the restoration of the temple at Jerusalem, the result of which was that Daniel "remained there with the *kings of Persia*," instead of going up to the city as he wished. The suggestion, therefore, here proposed is neither strained nor unnatural, that the writer of the introductory verse to chap. x. with a view to the application of Daniel's visions which he was about to make to his own times, has thought himself justified in assuming, though erroneously, that the mourning of Daniel took place "in the third year of Cyrus," not in the third year of Darius, where, except for his interpretation, the words of Daniel seem to place it. The result of this arrangement, as we have said, has been to create the fictitious king, "Darius the Mede," a king quite unknown in secular history, and one who we fearlessly declare never reigned, as distinguished from Darius son of Hystaspes; and thereby also to lengthen the period intervening between the time of the captivity and restoration, to the extent of forty-six years, being about the number of years required by any interpreter who would apply the contents of chap. ix. to the days of the Maccabees. That the

mourning of Daniel really took place "*in those days*," that is, in the early part of the reign of Darius, contrary to the view of the sacred Scribe, is confirmed both by the incidental mention of the intervention of a "prince of the kingdom of Persia," and also by the declaration of Daniel that he "remained there with the *kings* of Persia," which so well accords with the early part of the reign of Darius as spoken of by Ezra, when Ahasuerus or Artashashtha, the prince associated with Darius, son of Hystaspes, had interposed to obstruct the building of the temple.

These considerations have led the author to the conclusion, that the compiler of the book of Daniel, writing under the conviction that the taking away of the daily sacrifice, spoken of by Daniel, chap. ix. 27, was literally being accomplished before his own eyes in the days of Antiochus, and being thereby constrained to show how "threescore and two weeks" of years, or 434 years, had then in some way been fulfilled, has, by the insertion of this one verse, framed for himself, and for those who come after him, a fictitious mode of Biblical reckoning, by which exactly 434 years are interposed between the falsely assumed first year of Nebuchadnezzar, B.C. 604, and the year B.C. 170, or, as others put it, between B.C. 598 and B.C. 164, the remarkable precision of which interval forms so leading a feature in the arguments of those who would throw doubt upon the authenticity of the book of Daniel. We see no reason for closing our eyes as some do to the remarkable fact thus pointed out. On the contrary, we admire the critical sagacity which has detected the artificial arrangement, and at the same time thank the discoverers for one point at least, which seems to lead to the disentanglement of the historical difficulties in our book.

Again, we have remarked that the compiler has in his introductory heading to chap. x. declared that the thing revealed to Daniel was "true;" and that it concerned "great warfare," or armies; the main feature we know of the times in which he lived. And he calls upon his hearers to "consider the matter;" and to "have understanding of it in the vision." We prefer the punctuation which reads *Bemareh* (בְּמַרְעָה),

rather than *Bammareh* (בַּמַּרְהָ),—"Have understanding of it in vision," or in a vision: that is, either by attending to the interpreter's explanation of events given in the form of vision, or by applying for themselves the events passing before their own eyes in interpretation of Daniel's words. We shall hereafter show in detail how fully the interpreter has accomplished his historical illustration. We will now merely select one single passage to illustrate the idea—that part of chap. x. together with the first verse of chap. xi. are merely words of comment. Let us endeavour to throw ourselves into the position of one taking up the book of Daniel in the days of the Maccabees. The writings of the prophet we have assumed had at that time been laid aside and neglected as incomprehensible for many years; when the persecutions of Antiochus, the burning of the holy books, and the massacre of the people by that king with a view to the extirpation of the Jewish race, began to force upon the Jews the conviction that they were living in the great "time of trouble" spoken of in the last chapter of the book. To have taught openly amongst the people this application of Daniel's words to the events then passing around them, would have led to the immediate searching for and destruction of the holy book; to have written of the kings of Syria and Egypt by name, and to have represented their dynasties as about to come to an untimely end, would have been looked upon as treason, and would probably have led to the speedy execution of the writer. The Sadducean party who, as we have seen, did not accept the writings of Daniel, probably cavilled at the words of the prophecy itself, when brought to their attention by the sacred scribes. It may have then been objected by adverse critics in those days, as it has been objected by some in these days, concerning the vision of chapter x. If the prophet was lying prostrate, as he describes himself, "on his face towards the ground, and in a *deep sleep*," v. 9, how could he have "lifted up his eyes and have beheld the vision on the banks of the Hiddekel, and at the same time have witnessed the quaking of his companions, and their fleeing away to hide themselves?" And again, if, as he declares, he "retained no strength," v. 8,

how is it that he was able to sustain himself on his knees and the palms of his hands, and immediately after to "stand upright?" We venture to surmise, that in those days certain explanatory portions of chapters vii. and viii., in answer to Daniel's supplication to know the "truth," may possibly have been referred to commonly as the "Scripture of truth." And we do not think that we are too bold in the suggestion, that "Michael (who is like God), one of the chief *sarim*," or princes, may be identified with him who was carried away captive with Daniel, as "of the king's seed, and of the princes," and who after passing unharmed through the fire, where was seen one "like the son of God," was afterwards "promoted in the province of Babylon."

With the danger, then, of publicly offending before his eyes, it seems not unnatural that the interpreter of Daniel should have preferred to adopt the vague form of vision, while expounding to his countrymen his application of historical events to the words of the prophet, thereby avoiding the necessity of speaking of any king by name; and in the following passage we submit that he appears to commence his explanation by addressing himself to the trifling cavils made against the text. After transcribing Daniel's description of the great vision on the Hiddekel, he goes on in the words of the prophet, x. 7-8.

v. 7. "And I, Daniel, alone, saw the vision: for the men that were with me saw not the vision: but a great quaking fell upon them, so that they fled to hide themselves. Therefore I was left alone, and saw this great vision, and there remained no strength in me: for my comeliness was turned in me into corruption, and I retained no strength,—*velo atsarti koach*. [v. 16. *And behold one like the similitude of the sons of men touched my lips, then I opened my mouth and spake, and said unto him that stood before me, O my Lord, by the vision my sorrows are turned upon me, and I have retained no strength,—velo atsarti koach. For how can the servant of this my lord talk with this my lord, for as for me straightway there remained no strength in me, (i.e.) and there is no breath left in me.*] v. 9. Yet I heard the voice of his words: and when I heard the voice of his words, then was

I in a deep sleep on my face, with my face toward the ground. [v. 15. *And when he had spoken such words unto me, I set my face toward the ground, and I became dumb.*] v. 10. And behold an *hand* touched me, and set me upon my knees and upon the palms of my hands: and *he* said unto me, O Daniel, a man greatly beloved, understand the words that I speak unto thee, and stand upright: for unto thee am I now sent: and when *he* had spoken this word, I stood trembling. Then said *he* unto me, Fear not, Daniel. [v. 18. *Then there came again and touched me one like the appearance of a man, and he strengthened me: and he said, O man greatly beloved, fear not: peace be unto thee: be strong, yea be strong. And when he had spoken unto me, I was strengthened, and said, Let my lord speak, for thou hast strengthened me.*] v. 12. For, from the first day that thou didst set thy heart to understand, and to chasten thyself before thy God, thy words were heard. [Ch. xi. 1. *Also, I in the first year of Darius, even I, stood to confirm and to strengthen him.*] And I am come for thy words: v. 13, but the prince of the kingdom of Persia withstood me one-and-twenty days; but, lo, Michael, one of the chief princes, came to help me: and I remained there with the kings of Persia. [v. 20. *Then said he, Knowest thou wherefore I am come unto thee? And now will I return to fight with the prince of Persia: and when I am gone forth, lo, the prince of Grecia shall come.* . . . v. 21. *and there is none that holdeth with me but Michael your prince.*] v. 14. Now I am come to make thee understand what shall befall thy people in the latter days. . . Ch. xi. 2. And now will I shew thee the truth. [v. 21. *But I will shew thee that which is noted in the Scripture of truth.*]

The passage, beginning with v. 15, thus dissected and applied to the text,—the disjointed character of which every reader must have observed,—is in the original one consecutive passage, and is clearly intended as a free paraphrase of the twelve preceding verses of Daniel. It was probably written originally in a marginal column, the disjointed pieces of comment being arranged parallel with the respective portions of text. But the comment being, as we believe, afterwards mistaken for part of the text, the disjointed fragments

would appear thus to have become improperly united together. The sacred Scribe seems to borrow his angelic imagery, from the words of ch. viii. 15. He softens down the strong expressions of "corruption," into "sorrows,"—"deep sleep," into "dumb"ness,—and want of "strength," into want of "breath." The highly poetic expression in the text, "And an *hand* touched me," and *he* said, "O Daniel, a man greatly beloved," he paraphrases by "one like the appearance of a man" touched me, "and he said, O man greatly beloved." He refers the first day of Daniel's chastening himself, to the time of his "supplications, with fasting, and sackcloth, and ashes," in the first year of Darius, ix. 1-3; and as at that time the angel "stood to confirm and strengthen him," that is, Daniel, so now he explains, from chap. viii., that *now* the angel will "return to fight with the king of Persia,"* so making way for the coming of the king of Grecia. And then closes with the declaration that he will explain, "that which is noted in the scripture of truth," that is to say, what is written in ch. viii., concerning a king of fierce countenance, who shall in the latter days "take away the daily sacrifice," as he himself had lately witnessed, and who yet should come to an end; and more especially that which is written in ch. vii., concerning the king who shall rise up amongst ten kings, who shall make war with the saints, or holy people, and overcome them, a prediction which he considered then to have literally come to pass in the person of Antiochus.

We accept then the historical objections raised by critics against the latter part of the book of Daniel, in as far as they regard parts of the tenth and the eleventh chapters which appear to us to have been written in the days of the Maccabees. We also go along with Dr. Williams, where he observes, that "So little has the book (as now received) the framework of chronicle, that it presents four kings in succession, Nebuchadnezzar, Belshazzar, Darius, and Cyrus, whom no discoverable history arranges in that order." But,

* It appears that the writer, like most modern Jewish commentators, believed that the Darius of Daniel was the same as the Darius conquered by Alexander.

especially, we are ready to express ourselves indebted to the critics for the boldness with which they have laid bare the historical character of the above passages, which have too long been accepted as Holy Scripture; because they have thereby led to the discovery of the most important link in the evidence which proves that our book could not have been written at so late a date as they assume.

When Dr. Williams asks "on behalf of a book, for which prediction is claimed, that some evidence, or a probability, however slight, of its existence anterior to the event, should be shown," we are now enabled to reply:—

1st. That the two books of Maccabees incontestably prove that certain portions both of the Chaldee and also of the Hebrew parts of Daniel were written and studied long before Antiochus, or the year B.C. 170.

2nd. That the sober, matter-of-fact Josephus, records his belief that the eighth chapter of Daniel had been shown to Alexander 160 years before the date of Antiochus.

3rd. That the hand of a commentator attached to the book itself, about the time of Antiochus, and applying the prophecies of chapters vii. viii. ix. and xii., to events happening in his own days, clearly establishes the antiquity of, and reverence shown towards, those prophecies at that time: while the commentator himself attests that the latest vision in the book was *not* written in his own days, but recorded by one who was surnamed Belteshazzar, in the days of Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon, not less than 230 years before the time of Alexander.

Now what is the result of this proposed alteration of the chronology of Daniel, and removal from the text of a few perplexing passages of seeming comment inserted by the sacred Scribe? It is that these prophetic revelations, touching upon the most sublime and heavenly things, clothed in the most majestic language, and seeming to unfold the deep thoughts of the Almighty in His providence over human events, both past and yet to come—revelations which nevertheless when sought to be grasped and handled, have hitherto shown themselves to be involved in so much intricacy and obscurity as to

defy any but the vaguest interpretation even with any degree of certainty, by the most able hands, have thus become some of the most plain and intelligible in all Scripture, and of a distinctness clear as the crystal heaven from whence they came.

The sacred enigma of the Seventy Weeks, the interpretation of which has so long baffled the ability of both believer and sceptic, of both Jew and Christian, remains no longer an enigma to be solved; for the prophetic words of chapter ix. read off as well-known history of the past. And so far from acknowledging the "necessity" claimed by Dr. Williams, "that we should resign cheerfully, like mariners throwing infected goods overboard with their own hands, all those directly Messianic interpretations in which, without the intervention of any earlier person, or without broader suggestions of spiritual principle, Jesus of Nazareth is held to be distinctly, personally, foreseen as Christ," we are enabled to affirm with a distinctness beyond the power of human wit to gain-say, that this same Jesus of Nazareth, the history of whose inimitable career on earth is marvellous beyond the range of fiction to conceive, and the knowledge of whose divine precepts already tends "to cover the earth as the waters cover the sea," is indeed, and he only, without the intervention of any earlier person, "Messiah the Prince," so clearly foreseen and foretold by Daniel.

Again, the supposed type and antitype of chapters xi. and viii., Antiochus and anti-Christ, assumed characters which have afforded the text for many fantastic interpretations of the book, and by means of which two most distinct and separate visions are constantly confounded and mixed up together, entirely disappear from the predictions of Daniel, and we find ourselves unmistakably living in those "latter days," when the civilised world is, as it were, occupied by two wide-spread, overwhelming, religious powers, of which it is well-nigh weary; both of which have prospered for more than twelve centuries of time, and both which are portrayed to the life in the visions of this prophet; the one as mighty with the words of his mouth, the other as mighty with the sword of his hand; the one proceeding out of the ten frag-

ments of the fourth, or Roman empire, the other proceeding out of one of the four divisions of the third, or Grecian empire; the one with busy, worldly eyes, seeking to supervise and dictate to the kingdoms of the West, and persecuting "the holy people" till the time of the end; the other, with inexorable fierceness, ruling over the East, which has destroyed "the mighty and the holy people," forsaken the God of his fathers, the God of the Jews, "keeping the covenant and mercy with them that love him," the God of the Christians, known only as "Our Father," and has honoured "the God of forces," that is, of irresistible power and might, "in the most strongholds," ruling over many, and dividing the land.

It is through the book of Daniel that we are especially brought to a sense of the all-directing hand of the Almighty, "in whom we live, and move, and have our being," moulding like the potter the clay of his creation, not only as regards His chosen people Israel, but also as regards the kingdoms of the Gentiles, by whom they have been set aside. For while, according to the altered reckoning, we discover, to our amaze, that the destinies of Israel have been laid out in exact and even cycles of time, even from the time of Moses to the time of Christ, we at the same time discover that the vision of the great metallic image, which marks the rise and fall of the four successive empires of the Gentile world, beginning with the date of the vision, B.C. 560, and ending with the close of 1335 years of Mahommedan oppression, comprehends exactly the great predicted period of subjection of the holy people to the Gentiles, that is, the period of "seven times" spoken of by Moses in Leviticus ch. xxvi.,—the period of Gentile domination, spoken of by a greater than Moses,—the *annus magnus* of 2520 years, at the expiration of which, Jerusalem, we are told, shall cease to be trodden under foot. We learn how, after the fall of the great persecuting Eastern power, there shall be a time of tribulation such as never was: and are enabled to comprehend the words of our Lord, how, that immediately after that tribulation, "they shall see the Son of Man coming in the clouds of heaven." And lastly, we catch from Daniel the key-note of the present times, in

which the world is passing through another process of regeneration, and learn with certainty, that not until "he shall have accomplished to scatter the power of the holy people," can "all these things be finished." "Oh pray, then, for the peace of Jerusalem; they shall prosper that love thee."

"I have set watchmen upon the walls of Jerusalem, which shall never hold their peace day nor night. Ye that make mention of the Lord keep not silence, and give him no rest, till he establish, and make Jerusalem a praise upon earth."

DR. PUSEY'S EXPOSITION OF DANIEL'S PROPHECY OF THE SEVENTY WEEKS.

ANYTHING proceeding from the pen of so able, earnest, and conscientious a writer as Dr. Pusey, cannot fail at all times to command the most respectful attention: and we feel assured that the "Nine Lectures on Daniel the Prophet," delivered in the Divinity School of the University of Oxford—planned, as he professes, expressly for the purpose of counteracting the tide of scepticism let loose by the publication of "Essays and Reviews,"—will have been sought for and studied by many an earnest inquirer into the truth of Scripture prophecy.

Dr. Pusey has undertaken a task worthy of his position and reputation in the Church, viz. that of rescuing the book of Daniel from the grasp of modern critics, who, with much triumph and defiance, have consigned it to the domain of fiction or forgery: pronouncing it to be a work written in the time of the Maccabees, and innocently intended by the writer to encourage the Jews in

their great struggle against Antiochus Epiphanes. In vain have the works of Jahn, Hengstenberg, Auberlen, Barnes in America, and a host of English writers, taken up the defence of this most remarkable book of Scripture. The wonderful predictions contained in it, professing to unfold the destinies of Daniel's people, from the time of their captivity at Babylon, when he wrote, even to the far distant times of their dispersion amongst the nations, and future restoration into favour with God—predictions which, as a matter of history, have sustained the constancy and energies of that people, not only through their deadly struggle with the powers of heathenism in the days of Antiochus, but also through that still more trying period of desolation and oppression with which they have been afflicted, even to the present day—these sublime and majestic visions, we say, are deliberately classed in the minds of modern expositors together with the vague poetical prophecies of Virgil or the Sibylline books, and condemned by some of the most acute and learned critics of the age as premeditated works of fiction. "The unguineness of Daniel," writes Auberlen, "has become an axiom in modern theology, so that it is thought quite superfluous to adduce any proof of that assertion; and the most recent commentator says, in a very short and explicit manner, no sensible man can entertain a doubt on the subject."*

* Preface to Auberlen on the Prophecies of Daniel, &c.

Dr. Williams, the Essayist, speaking of the prophecy of the Seventy Weeks, asserts that "two results are clear beyond fair doubt, that the period of 'weeks' ended in the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes, and that those portions of the book supposed to be specially predictive are a history of past occurrences up to that reign."* "The original place of the book amongst the later Hagiographa of the Jewish Canon, and the absence of any mention of it by the son of Sirach, strikingly confirm this view of its origin: and if some obscurity rests upon details, the general conclusion, that the book contains no predictions, except by analogy and type, can hardly be gainsaid."†

If this indeed be so, how painful and degraded is the position of those whose faith in Christianity is grounded upon the exact fulfilment of Daniel's prediction of Christ: who have been accustomed to value this book as the chief connecting link between the histories of the Old and New Testament; and to look upon it as occupying a distinct and defined position, otherwise left blank and dreary, in the continuous scheme of Providence laid open in Scripture, from the day of the selection of the sons of Abraham as God's "holy people," even to the yet future time "when he shall have accomplished to scatter the power of the holy people, and all these things shall be finished." If the records contained in the book of Daniel are records of real

* "Essays and Reviews," p. 69. † P. 76.

events, and the predictions were written at the time when Daniel professes to have lived, then does it follow of necessity, that inspiration, prophecy, and miracle,—the three impossibilities of modern philosophy, in connexion with the past history of the world, inasmuch as they are assumed to be subversive of the fixed and undeviating laws of the Creator, have been signally exemplified in the events recorded in this book. If, on the contrary, this single book of Scripture can be shown to be fiction, the foundation of Christianity is undermined: the undying expectations of Judaism, based upon the words of successive prophets, fade into empty air as childish dreams: we doubt whether the whole volume of sacred history may not be the work of impostors; and the only wise course to be pursued would seem to be, to place ourselves at the feet of those profound philosophers who have laid bare the great deception, and who profess to teach the will and ways of the Creator from the surrounding works of His creation. "The writer of this book," observes Dr. Pusey, "were he not Daniel, must have lied on a most frightful scale, ascribing to God prophecies which were never uttered, and miracles which are assumed never to have been wrought. In a word, the whole book would be one lie in the name of God."*

Can any intelligent and sensitive mind consent to remain in doubt on such a question? Tell me,

* "Introductory Lecture," p. 1.

cries the despairing, yet unlearned inquirer, conscious of his inability to examine for himself, is it true that some of the ablest and best instructed men of modern days have believed, and undertake to prove, that this book of Daniel was written, not, as it professes to have been, in the time of the captivity of the Jews at Babylon, but some three hundred years later, in the time of the Maccabees? Dr. Williams and his associates have much to answer for, when they put forth the hasty, yet authoritative reply, that certain forms of language made use of in the book of Daniel "remove all philological and critical doubt as to the age of the book," as having been written long after the times of the captivity.*

Dr. Pusey, as Regius Professor of Hebrew in the University of Oxford, undertakes to show that this assertion is utterly false, and without foundation; and it requires no great depth of knowledge of Hebrew and Chaldee to follow him through his analysis, and to feel assured that he has established satisfactorily this one decisive fact, that the language of Daniel is the same, or nearly the same, as the language of the book of Ezra, and that, so far as any

* "Not only Macedonian words such as *symphonia* and *psanterion*, but the texture of the Chaldaic, with such late forms as לְכוּן, כֶּן, and אֵלֵן the pronominal כ, and מ, having passed into ך, and not only minute descriptions of Antiochus's reign, but the stoppage of such description at the precise date, B.C. 169, remove all philological and critical doubt as to the age of the book."—*Essays and Reviews*, p. 76.

test can be applied, it is not the language of the times of the Maccabees. He boldly affirms, that "no opponent has ever ventured to look steadily at the facts, of the correspondence of the language of Daniel and Ezra, and their difference from the language of the earliest Targums."* And again, "the question which any opponent has to solve is this, whence this marked agreement between the Aramaic of Daniel and Ezra, and this marked difference of the Aramaic of both from that of the Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan? Men are dishonest to themselves and to others when they try to escape from this broad question under cover of the dust of other counter-questions."† Dr. Pusey has spared no pains to satisfy himself that the language of Daniel coincides with his age and circumstances. "I have examined," he says, "expressly for this object, every notable word and idiom used in the Hebrew of Daniel, and have set down under four heads,—

"1. What is peculiar to Daniel.

"2. What he has in common with the middle period of language, *i.e.* words or idioms not occurring in the Pentateuch, but received in books free from the influence of Aramaic.

"3. What Daniel has in common with the later writers, *i.e.* words or idioms, which in our remaining Hebrew, do not occur before the times bordering on the captivity, such as Jeremiah.

* P. 56.

† P. 42.

"4. What like other writers of the same date he has revived out of the Hebrew of the Penta-teuch."

"There is," he says, "for the most part little characteristic in any of this language,"—"what is characteristic falls in with the time of Daniel."*

He then proceeds to analyze the Aramaic portions of Daniel, especially the pronominal forms *hon* and *con*, *den* and *illeen*, which are said so distinctly to mark the late date of the language; and sums up his observations thus: "These endings, which are to be so characteristic as to establish the later date of the Aramaic of Daniel, are endings belonging to all Aramaic. The other forms are exceptional archaisms apparently in the language both of Daniel and Ezra." . . . "Criticism, which should have made endings which are an integral part of the language, which occur not in one dialect of it only but in three, not in one case but in several, characteristic of a later date of a book in which they occur, could not have been imagined in any well-known language. It would have carried on its face its own refutation. In fine, then, the Hebrew of Daniel is exactly that which you would expect in a writer of his age, and under his circumstances. It has not one single idiom unsuited to that time. The few Aryan or Syriac words remarkably belong to it. The Chaldee marks itself out as such as could not have been written at the time

* P. 36.

when, if it had not been a Divine or prophetic book, it must have been written."*

The Rev. J. M'Gill, to whom Dr. Pusey refers, sums up a condensed essay on the Chaldee of Daniel and Ezra with these words: "Thus we have seen that the biblical Chaldee is distinguished by many peculiarities which mark an early stage of the development of the language. Some of the peculiarities are also found in Syriac: others have altogether disappeared from the Aramean, or are found in the later language only as exceptional cases which rarely occur. And we have certainly seen that Daniel does not approach nearer than Ezra in the language of the Targums. On the contrary, there are one or two phenomena which show that the book of Daniel was written a considerable time before that of Ezra."†

Again, Dr. Pusey has dispersed the mists in which some have endeavoured to envelope the book of Daniel from the occurrence here and there of Aryan and assumed Macedonian expressions. He has shown that the supposed Macedonian Greek is not Macedonian; and has truly remarked, that nothing can be more agreeable to the circumstances and position of Daniel than the occasional use of words of Aryan extraction, and of two or three Greek words for musical instruments, living as he did at Babylon, in the midst of the great stream of commerce to and fro, from East to West,

* P. 55. † Journ. Sac. Lit., Jan. 1861, p. 373.

where foreign productions of every description must have been daily exposed in the markets, and where foreign names for these productions must have been on the lips of hundreds of persons passing backwards and forwards through that great commercial city. As regards the suggested proof of the lateness of the composition of the book, from the omission of all reference to Daniel by Jesus, son of Sirach, any such inference is entirely neutralized by the fact, that the author of the book of Ezra stands precisely in the same position as Daniel in this respect, for the name of Ezra is also omitted from the list of Jewish worthies in the book of Ecclesiasticus.

Dr. Pusey has grappled fearlessly and successfully with the philological arguments of his opponents ; and, as far as regards the Chaldee portions, or one-half at least of the book, we think that no future student of Daniel, after perusing Dr. Pusey's work, will be disposed to allow that the composition could have been so late as the time of the Maccabees, or anywhere but near the times of the captivity. On the contrary, when he considers the fact of the combination of the two languages—Hebrew and Chaldee—in the books of Daniel and Ezra, and in these two books of Scripture only, with the exception of a single verse of Chaldee in Jeremiah, a fact which distinguishes these writings from all other books of the Canon, he will be disposed to look upon the book of Daniel as stamped with the peculiar mark which could only appropriately belong to a composition written at a time, when Hebrews,

accustomed to the use of their native tongue, were dwelling captive in the land of the Chaldees.*

Dr. Pusey, in conscious triumph, closes this portion of his work with the words, "Rationalism may rebel, as it has rebelled, but it dare not now, with any moderate show of honesty, abuse philology to cover its rebellion."†

Assuming, then, that the question of the language of Daniel, as a substantive proof of unauthenticity, has been set at rest, and that his prophecies, therefore, unless forged by some ingenious impostor, were written somewhere near the time when Ezra wrote his book, we will now proceed to examine some of the other arguments which have been raised to prove that the book was a forgery of the time of the Maccabees.

It is not our purpose, even were we qualified, to follow Dr. Pusey through the whole course of his able arguments in refutation of his opponents, and in support of the genuineness of the book of Daniel. We are content to rest the issue of the genuineness and inspiration of that book on two main features of internal evidence—on the fulfilment or non-fulfilment of the two most remarkable pre-

* Auberlen, we think, has rightly explained the cause of the difference of Daniel's language in different parts of his book. The Chaldee portions relate chiefly to the history of the kingdoms of the heathen world, and may probably have been intended for the ears of Chaldeans as well as Jews. The Hebrew portions chiefly relate to events immediately affecting the Jews, and are specially written in the sacred language for them.—*Auberlen on Daniel*, p. 31.

† P. 57.

dictions contained in it, viz., of the symbolical prophecy of the great image in the second chapter, with its supplementary expansions in the seventh and twelfth chapters; and of the well-known prophecy of the "Seventy Weeks."

If it can be shown that these two plain historical predictions — the one comprehending a series of events extending over not less than twenty-four centuries of time, the other over a long period of four hundred and ninety years — have been literally and exactly fulfilled, in a manner not to be mistaken, then will the inspiration of the writer of these predictions, and the genuineness of the writings, so tested, have been made manifest beyond contradiction. And if, again, the great outline of the world's history, to the end of time, as prophetically laid down in this book of Daniel, shall be shown to have been accomplished hitherto in minute accordance with his predictions, then will the objections of those who cavil at the minuteness of fulfilment of other less extended prophecies, be looked upon by impartial inquirers as both idle and out of place.

A deeper and more reverential study of the book of Daniel will, we humbly submit, lead the mind into wide and interesting fields of contemplation, both as regards the past and future intercourse of God with His chosen people, not open at once to view on the first superficial reading of the book. This is a proposition which we hope to be able to establish in the course of the following observations. Meanwhile, we confess that the study of this book of Scripture,

beyond all others, has ever afforded to our understanding the most convincing and sustaining evidence, under all temptations to doubt, that the hand of God is ever near and about His creatures, and that the events of this world are continuously and immediately under the guidance of His directing power.

There stands the great image still before our eyes, as it stood some 2400 years ago ; in the same vivid outline and exceeding brightness, as it appeared to the mental vision of King Nebuchadnezzar in his dream ; with its head of gold ; its breast and arms of silver ; its belly and thighs of brass ; its legs of iron ; and its feet, part of iron, and part of miry clay. And there also stands affixed to this symbolic figure a superscription, written at the time, showing that its distinct, five-fold division was intended to represent, first, four great empires then about to rise in succession on the theatre of the world ; and then, the division into ten fragmentary kingdoms of the last and most powerful of these empires ; the head of the image, as declared by the superscription, touching the times of the Babylonian empire, and its feet reaching down to "the days when the God of Heaven shall set up a kingdom never to be destroyed." No honest interpreter of this superscription can deny the distinctness of the interpretation, nor that it was the intention of the writer of it to carry the mind of the reader over periods reaching far into futurity, even to the end of this world. Did ever impostor, foretelling the future, we may ask, venture to subject his predictions to so lengthened

an ordeal of actual events, or ever so clearly define the meaning of his own predictions ?

But, again, the times of the ten fragmentary kingdoms proceeding out of the last empire are, in the seventh chapter, more minutely unfolded, and described as extending over a definite yet lengthened period of time, marked by the domination of a most peculiar and anomalous power, which, it is said, shall prevail till "*the saints of the Most High* shall take the kingdom, and possess it for ever and ever." For out of these ten kingdoms, we are told, shall come up a power, "diverse from the first," an arrogant and domineering power, symbolically described as "a horn that had eyes, and a mouth that spake very great things," into whose hands the *saints of the Most High* shall be given, "until a time, times, and the dividing of time," that is, as we consider it should be interpreted, for a definite period of 1260 years. And after the destruction of this remarkable power, it is again declared that "the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven shall be given to *the people of the saints* (עַם קְדִישִׁי) of the *Most High*." Lastly, lest any doubt should exist as to the meaning of the expression "Saints of the Most High," mention is made again, in the twelfth chapter, of the very same period, of "time, times, and a half," followed immediately by the words, "And when He shall have accomplished to scatter the power of the *holy people* (עַם קְדִישִׁי), all these things shall be finished." We have, then, but to satisfy ourselves as

to who are the "holy people," or "saints of the Most High," here spoken of, and the whole vision, as interpreted in the superscription from the days of the Babylonian king to the present time, will be vividly represented before our eyes.

Now there can be no question as to the people who are described throughout Scripture as the "holy people" of God. Of whom, except of the sons of Abraham, has it been said, "Thou art a holy people (עַם קָדוֹשׁ) unto the Lord God, the Lord thy God hath chosen thee to be a special people unto Himself, above all people that are on the face of the earth"? Of whom had it been foretold, except of the sons of Abraham, "the Lord shall scatter you among the nations, and ye shall be left few among the heathen"? Of what other people in the world has it been said, "If any of them be driven out unto the utmost parts of heaven, from thence will the Lord thy God gather thee, and from thence will He fetch thee?" And, again, what other people in the world, existing as a nation when these words were uttered, now lies scattered, though yet distinct, throughout every kingdom of the earth, except the sons of Abraham? Of the sons of Abraham, therefore, in their exile and dispersion, does the prophecy of Daniel speak, when he foretells the oppression of the "saints" for a period of 1260 years, trodden down by that peculiar and tyrannous power which proceeds out of the embers of the Roman empire, and which is elsewhere unmistakeably described as seated on the seven hills, and "drunk with the blood of the

saints, and " also " with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus."

In this opinion we have the support of Auberlen, who writes, "By the people of 'the saints of the Most High,' to whom dominion is given, Daniel evidently could only understand the people of Israel, as distinguished from the heathen nations and kingdoms, which were to rule till then. In this point Roos, Prieswerk, Hofman, agree with Hitzig, Bertholdt, and others. The prophet's words refer to the re-establishment of the kingdom of Israel, concerning which the disciples asked our Saviour immediately before His ascension."*

We are aware that many would interpret the giving up of the kingdom and dominion to "the saints of the Most High," as representing the future triumphant reign of the Gentile Church of Christ, that is to say, of that ecclesiastical hierarchy and its branches which now stands prominent among the religions of the world as the representative of Christendom, seated on, and clinging to, its throne on the seven hills of the Eternal City. And, unquestionably, the followers of Christ are throughout the New Testament looked upon and designated as "saints," that is, true worshippers of Christ, as distinguished then from the world of unbelievers. But when, it may be asked, except in this primitive state of innocence and purity, has the Christian Church ever been cast down and persecuted, meek and trodden under foot? When,

* Auberlen on Daniel, p. 216.

alas! except in its early innocence, has it ever been otherwise than haughty, worldly, persecuting, cruel, steeped in human blood? God forbid that the kingdoms of this world should ever again be subject to the triumphant and uncontrolled supremacy of a domineering ecclesiastical Power such as this. God forbid, also, that they should be witness to the domination even of God's ancient holy people while yet remaining in their unbelief of Christ. When Daniel speaks of the future glory of the children of Israel as "saints" in the kingdom of the Son of Man, and of the accomplishment, or termination, of the dispersion of the "holy people," he clearly refers to those then far-distant times when the chosen people of God shall again recognise their God, and God shall again "take pleasure in His people;" to those very times, in fact, which are so distinctly and pathetically described by Zechariah, the contemporary of Daniel, when he exclaims, in the name of God, "I will pour upon the house of David, and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the spirit of grace and supplication, and they shall look upon me whom they have pierced," &c.—"I will hear them: I will say, It is My people: and they shall say, The Lord is my God,"—"and His feet shall stand in that day on the Mount of Olives,"—"and the Lord my God shall come, and all the saints (כָּל-קְדוֹשִׁים) with thee."* Daniel and Zechariah both refer to the times spoken of also by that zealous and learned Hebrew of the

* Zechariah, xii. 10; xiii. 9; xiv. 5.

Hebrews,* brought up at the feet of Gamaliel, Paul of Tarsus, where he says, "There shall come out of Zion the Deliverer, and turn away ungodliness from Jacob;"† when the branches of the olive-tree, "wild by nature," viz., the Christian branches sprung from the Jewish Church, shall no longer boast against the "natural" branches, for a time cut off, viz., unbelieving Israel; but when the root shall be re-established as nourishing the branches, and both shall be united and grow together in one goodly olive-tree,—that blessed day of union into one fold, under one shepherd, when the receiving again of the children of Israel into favour shall be, as Paul assures us, to both Jew and Gentile, "as life from the dead:" when "they shall sing the song of Moses, the servant of God, and the song of the Lamb, saying, Great and marvellous are Thy works, Lord God Almighty; just and true are Thy ways, Thou King of *saints*."‡

Such was the interpretation set by Daniel upon the words, "saints of the Most High." Such has ever been the interpretation of Jewish commentators, looking for the restoration of Israel in the kingdom of the Messiah; and such should be the interpretation of every Christian who believes that the "Son of Man," "the anointed Prince," "the righteous branch unto David," came into the world, though rejected of His own, to be "a light to lighten the Gentiles," and "*Hereafter*,"—as He himself declared to Caiaphas, when He said, "Ye shall see the Son of Man sitting

* Phil. iii. 5. † Rom. xi. 26. ‡ Rev. xv. 3.

on the right hand of power and coming in the clouds of heaven"*—"to be the glory of His people Israel."†

Thus, then, it appears that there has been lying open before us, for more than two thousand years, a page of the sacred volume professing to contain a distinct revelation from the Most High of the history of His elect people, the seed of Abraham, even down to the time when they shall again possess the kingdom. When the Son of Man shall be king over all the earth, judging the earth in righteousness with all who worship Him in spirit and in truth, both Jew and Gentile, as His "saints:" For the Gentiles, by faith in Christ, *the* seed of Abraham, are also "Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise."‡ "The dream was certain, and the interpretation thereof sure."

And, therefore, side by side this sacred volume, the page of secular history has been slowly, yet continuously, recording the same great outline of events, in perfect agreement with Daniel's interpretation of the vision.

Every well-instructed youth can tell us how, immediately after the fall of the Babylonian empire, rose the empire of the Medes and Persians, who, first by the hand of Cyrus, and afterwards more completely by the hand of Darius, destroyed that empire, levelling the mighty walls of Babylon to the ground, and carrying off the far-famed gates of brass;§ when the last of their local kings, Belshazzar, as Daniel informs us, was slain, and the

* Matt. xxvii. 64.

† Luke, ii. 32.

‡ Gal. iii. 29.

§ Herod. iii. 159.

kingdom passed into the hands of the Persians, (*Upharsin*); how the Persians in their turn were overthrown by the Greeks under Alexander of Macedon; and how the Greek empire in the East, on the death of that prince, was divided into four parts amongst his successors; and how at length that empire also was overthrown by the greatest and most powerful of all empires, the empire of Rome. He could also tell us, how the Roman empire in its latter days, with one foot planted in the East, the other in the West, upon the seven hills, preserved its dominion even till the middle of the sixth century; and how, in the course of that century, an overwhelming torrent of barbarians from the North swept over Italy, and caused the empire of the West to cease; how these barbarians were, as it were, swallowed up and absorbed amongst the conquered Romans, "prostrating themselves, half savage and half heathen as they were, at the feet of the high-priest of Rome:"* and how this great and terrible empire had then become split into many kingdoms, truly represented by the ten toes of the image, composed partly of the iron strength of the old Empire, and partly of the fragile materials of the Gothic invaders. Again he would remember, how, when Rome itself had sunk to the very lowest point of abasement, and seemed well-nigh doomed to destruction by these barbarian hordes, about the beginning of the seventh century,† it began again to

* D'Aubigné's *Reformation* (English Translation), book i, chap. i.

† Gibbon, vi. 158.

lift up its head, and, rising as it were from its ashes, assumed a form of power "diverse" from any which had yet presented itself to the world; spiritual, yet also temporal; possessed of no material power, yet exercising an influence in the world to be compared even with that of the ancient empire; a little horn, yet with a mouth speaking very great things, even down to the present day.

The germ of this remarkable power was planted by the genius and virtues of Pope Gregory the Great, whose wisdom and Christian spirit, had they always prevailed with his successors, might have established, as some would now persuade us to believe that Papism is yet capable of establishing, a spiritual kingdom on the seven hills, as a model of sanctity, a beacon light, spreading through the world its pure and holy rays, and making ready the way for the coming of the kingdom of the Son of man. With worldly power, however, came worldly passions, and thirst of worldly sway. The Papal hierarchy quickly forfeited the high position in which it had been placed, and assumed that character for superstition, cruelty, intrigue, and falsehood, which it has maintained till this day. Claiming in its chief to represent the meek and peaceful spirit of Christ upon earth, its hands are dipped in blood. Putting forth dogmas of the most inconceivable nature to be received under penalty of non-salvation. Establishing a system of "lying wonders," to deceive the multitude into devout submission. Usurping the more than godly power of canonizing sinners into saints. At one

time causing by its scandals and corruptions, the revolt of the Reformation in Germany; at another, the furious outburst of infidelity in France; debasing the minds and energies of those nations which have submitted to the influence of its clergy; till at length, even in the birth-place of its power, it is felt that it would be a blessing to mankind if so intriguing, worldly, and superstitious a power were removed from its high estate, as a chief impediment in the way of progress of truth and civilisation, and of the final gathering of all religions throughout the world into one fold. Speaking of the barbarian hordes which invaded Italy, D'Aubigné writes, "It was the sturdy shoulders of these children of the idolatrous north that succeeded in placing on the supreme throne of Christendom a pastor on the banks of the Tiber. At the beginning of the seventh century, these events were accomplishing in the West precisely at the period when the power of Mahomet arose in the East." And both these remarkable powers, therefore, have maintained their spiritual existence for upwards of 1200 years.

Such is the striking and plain fulfilment in history of the vision of the great image to the present time. We wait "the accomplishment of the scattering of the power of the holy people," and the exaltation of "the saints of the Most High," to complete the consummation. And who that surveys the state of the surrounding nations of the world can fail to recognise amongst them "the holy people," still bowed down by oppression, yet already shaking off with no gentle

hand the grasp of the oppressor,—still scattered over the face of the earth, and yet preserved distinct by the Almighty, as “a special people unto Himself above all people that are on the face of the earth,” as if for the very purpose here foretold; patiently waiting and watching, in accordance with the twelfth article of their faith, till “the kingdom, as it was originally, shall return to the people of Israel, and they shall inhabit their own land, build their temple and offer sacrifices, as they did in their primitive station; the priests shall attend their service, and the Levites glorify God in their hymns,”* “For God hath not cast away His people which He foreknew.”† The covenant with Abraham was to give unto him, and to his seed after him, “all the land of Canaan for an everlasting possession.”‡ Moses spoke of this people from the beginning as a nation of priests, and how a fiery law was given at Mount Sinai unto his “saints.”§ Isaiah, speaking of the future exaltation of Israel, cries, “Say ye to the daughter of Zion, Behold, thy salvation cometh;” “and they shall call them the holy people, (עַם־קֹדֶשׁ), the redeemed of the Lord.”|| While Daniel foretells how the little horn from amongst the ten kingdoms of the broken Roman empire, shall in the course of his domination “make war with the saints,”¶ (עַם־קֹדֶשׁ), a persecution which was fulfilled to the letter in the times of the Inquisi-

* Jewish Catechism.

† Rom. xi. 2.

‡ Gen. xvii. 6.

§ Deut. xxxiii. 2.

|| Isa. lxii. 12.

¶ Dan. vii. 21, 22.

tion, and which is even now carried on, till the time when they shall possess the kingdom:* not even alluding, in this place, which is most remarkable, to the existence of the Gentile Christian Church, except under this form of oppression. "The chief point," writes Auberlen, "which it is necessary to recognise distinctly, and to express simply, is, that the commencement of the kingdom spoken of in the 2nd and 7th chapters of Daniel is nothing else but the second coming of our Lord Jesus Christ," "the re-establishment of the kingdom of Israel."†

We are then content, as we have said, to rest the genuineness and inspiration of the book of Daniel on the fulfilment or non-fulfilment of this great prophecy. Had it been written even in the present day, after the events, in simulation of prophecy, we can scarcely conceive anything more pointed than the description contained in it, of what has actually come to pass.

Nevertheless, we regret to find ourselves not entirely at unison with Dr. Pusey in this interpretation. Most are agreed as far as the division of the Roman empire into many kingdoms. But the peculiar power which rises up amongst them, and which is said to have dominion for "a time, times, and dividing of time," that is, for a period which we consider to have nearly expired during the continu-

* See also Da Costa's "*Israel and the Gentiles*," pp. 217-19, concerning the cruel decrees of the Councils of Toledo against the Jews in the early part of the 7th century.

† Auberlen, p. 216.

ance of these kingdoms, Dr. Pusey looks for as yet to come into existence. The future destinies and glory of God's elect, but cast-off people, which we cannot but feel form the chief subject of Daniel's predictions, do not seem to come even within the range of his contemplation; while in his tenderness towards Rome, so far from looking upon the Papal power as the oppressor of the "holy people," he seems to hint at the present persecution of the See of Rome itself as the fulfilment of the prophecy.* The difference between us is a broad one, and has formed with some minds an important spring of action. So much so, that we have seen such men as Dr. Newman, influenced by the same admiration of the Church of Rome, and deep contempt for the scarcely more erring Jewish Church, actually driven from communion with the Church of England, as he tells us,† by the idea of a Protestant bishop,—a bishop of the circumcision, one who boasted of his Jewish descent,—being placed at Jerusalem. This was "the blow which finally shattered the faith in the Anglican Church," of this most frail of religious barks, as if the tendency of the movement were not in accordance with the ways of God, and not indeed a first step at least, though a remote one, towards the restoration of His holy people to their own land, in communion with the Church of Christ. But we do not wish to dwell upon the unfulfilled portion of this prophecy. We have stated our convictions.

* P. 77.

† Newman's *Apologia*, p. 248.

The time is yet future, and events will decide the question, whether Papal Rome is looked upon in prophecy as the persecutor or the persecuted, the erring or the perfect Church. We will merely add, that what was foreknown to Divine prescience in the days of Daniel, is now known to us by the experience of past history; and it is inconceivable to the historian, that prophetic foresight should have overlooked in these visions two of the most prominent events of history which have acted in retardation of the establishment of the kingdom of God, and the restoration of his "saints," the chief object and burthen of Daniel's visions, and both which would appear to have been overlooked, if Dr. Pusey's mode of interpretation is the true one. We have before us clearly represented in the book of Daniel:—

1st. The prostrate, cast-off people of God, stiff-necked, yet earnest, waiting for the restoration of the kingdom to Israel, and for "the kingdom of God." The seed of Abraham in the flesh.

2nd. The ever-swelling multitude of devout Gentile worshippers of the Son of Man, represented by the stone "*cut out without hands*," silently, yet unceasingly, lifting up the prayer, "Thy kingdom come." The seed of Abraham by adoption.

And there also, we feel assured, from the events of history, must be represented,—

3rd. The great apostasy of the East, which has now literally trodden under foot, with one short interval of relief, the holy land, and holy city Jeru-

saalem, for well-nigh forty-two prophetic months ; to the exclusion from thence of God's "holy people." The little horn of the eighth chapter.

4th. The great harlot church of the West, seated on the seven hills, casting out its flood of idolatry, falsehood, and superstition, to the deep abhorrence of God's "holy people," and forming an impassable barrier to their union with the visible Church of Christ. The little horn of the seventh chapter.

Here are portrayed the two witnesses of the Apocalypse "trodden under foot." Here are "the beast" and "the false prophet," domineering till "the Ancient of days did sit" and till the appearance of "the Son of Man coming with the clouds of heaven." And here are the redeemed on Mount Zion, singing the song of Moses, the servant of God, and the song of the Lamb.

Surely the "Times of the Gentiles," which, we are told, shall last till Jerusalem shall cease to be trodden under foot,*—the commencement of which times may perhaps be placed at that marked epoch in the history of the Jewish Church, when ten out of twelve parts of the holy people were cast off as unworthy of the lofty title of the people of God, —have now nearly run their course. Philosophy and literature, which from that time began to diffuse their light throughout the world, have already accomplished all that they can, and were intended to accomplish for the advancement of

* Luke, xxi. 24.

human intellect, and more than could have been accomplished singly by the then Jewish Church ; for though "the world by wisdom knew not God," yet religion without wisdom, clergy without laity, endowed Church without secular superintendence, except under a theocracy, tend but to degeneracy and superstition. The Gentile Church would seem, at length, to have lost its savour. The world has grown weary of disputation upon dogma, tradition, ritual, and garments, to the stifling of the breath of holiness. Intellect and philosophy have now outrun piety and reverence, and religion sighs and prays for the arrival of that dispensation, which the holy Daniel has put into our hearts to long for and expect, as now soon about to dawn in the horizon ; when the tabernacle of David, which is fallen down, shall be rebuilt,* and the house of Judah shall once again be exalted amongst the kingdoms of the Gentiles.

Let Israel but once accept the everlasting truth, that the Spirit of the Almighty Creator, pervading all things, may, without derogation from His unity, take up His abode within the souls of holy men, and that once at least, in furtherance of His beneficent purposes towards mankind, He has thus manifested Himself in human form, in the person of "The Most Holy,"† who took to Himself the title "Son of Man," and the day will not be far distant, when the courts of the Temple of Jerusalem shall echo again to the praise of the Almighty :—

* Acts, xv. 16.

† Dan. ix. 24.

"O sing unto the Lord a new song :
 Let the congregation of the saints praise him.
 Let Israel rejoice in him that made him :
 And the children of Zion be joyful in their King."

Then shall the grandeur and simplicity of the creed of Israel, which recognises but one eternal and indivisible Spirit, and which suffers no worship of created beings, a creed adapted to the understanding, and reaching to the heart of every enlightened being upon earth, stand forth in contrast with that degraded faith, fitted only to an age of ignorance and darkness, which dims the majesty of the Almighty in clouds of incense to Virgin, saints, images, and angels; which dares to speak to us of the "mother of God," and to dogmatize on the mode of her conception; and which professes to create, localize, and sacrifice God by the hands of its benighted priests.* Then shall the dry bones of the house of Israel, whose hope was lost, come again together, bone to his bone, and rise as it were again from their graves;† then shall Ephraim and Judah be united together as one people. The Sanctuary shall be re-established, "the place of my throne and the place of the soles of my feet," on a scale of magnificence and dimensions suited to the sanctuary of the whole earth. A river of living

* Dr. Manning, in his late Pastoral, speaks of "the Dogmatic Bull of the Immaculate Conception:" of "the Divine worship of the holy Mass:" and of "God incarnate dying on the cross" This doctrine of the death of the Almighty and Eternal God is truly appalling.

† Ezek. xxxvii. 1-17.

waters shall flow abundantly towards the East, not from the seven hills of Rome, but from the sanctuary of Jerusalem, the holy hill of Zion. "There shall be a very great multitude of fish:" "and every-thing shall live whither the river cometh."*

But modern critics profess to have made the discovery, that this pretended vision is a forgery written after the facts, and merely founded upon the events of Jewish history up to the time of Antiochus Epiphanes. Now we are not amongst those who would deny the exercise of human judgment in the investigation of the contents of Holy Scripture: on the contrary, we rejoice to see the most free and searching examination applied to them. But how have the critics performed the task which they have undertaken? Dr. Pusey has well exposed the shifts and shuffles to which they have been reduced, in their endeavour to reduce the times of the four distinct empires of Daniel within the compass of three; and those who will consult his work will find that there is no absurdity or contradiction which they have not entertained in order to effect this hopeless purpose. The most approved method seems to be, by placing Daniel captive amongst the Assyrians at Nineveh, instead of amongst the Babylonians, and this in the face of circumstantial history, be it written when and by whom it may, connecting him first with the Babylonian Empire, and then with the Persian, under both which

* Ezek. xlvii. 1-9.

we are told that Daniel held high office near the throne. "Ewald is right," said Bunsen, "that Daniel was led captive in the first Assyrian invasion, and lived and prophesied in Nineveh, not in Babylon." But how can Ewald be right, in the face of the words of the writer of the book of Daniel to the contrary? What does Ewald, or Baron Bunsen, know concerning Daniel, more than what is written in the book of Daniel itself? It is true, that we find the names of "Noah, Daniel, and Job,"* twice coupled together as examples of holiness in the book of Ezekiel, which book precedes that of Daniel; and no unprejudiced mind can fail to admit the difficulty involved in these passages, of believing that one so young as Daniel must then have been, and one who was then associated with the magicians and astrologers of Babylon, should have been ranked, while yet alive, with the most revered saints of antiquity in Jewish history. This is the only semblance of an argument for placing Daniel in the earlier time of the Assyrian Empire. But, on the other hand, is it conceivable that a saint unheard of, according to these critics, except through the two passages in question, should have thus been placed on a level with Noah and Job? And again, if it is reasonable, in explanation of the difficulty, to accept with Ewald the hypothesis of an unknown Daniel, together with an unknown history of him entirely at variance with all tradition con-

* "Though Noah, Daniel, and Job were in it, as I live, saith the Lord God, they shall deliver neither sons nor daughters; they shall but deliver their own souls." Ezek. xiv. 20.

cerning him, would it not be equally reasonable, we may ask, to adopt the more simple idea, of the possibility of an error in transcription, and that in this particular chapter of Ezekiel, where the name Daniel is now read, the name perhaps of David* may have been originally written? For the name of David, it may be observed, is truly applicable to the passages. The name of Daniel would seem to be inapplicable. Daniel probably had neither sons nor daughters to save, for the tradition is that he was a eunuch in the palace.† How then could it be said of him that he should not save them? Whereas, when Jerusalem was threatened ‡ in the days of Hezekiah, as now in the days of Ezekiel, it is said to have been saved "for David's sake;" and so the sons and daughters of Noah were saved for their father's sake: while Job offered sacrifice continually for his sons and daughters, and so till the time of his last trial, we may presume, they had been saved for his sake.§ But if "David," not "Daniel," may possibly have been here written, where would be the ground for Bunsen's authoritative decision, that Ewald is right in supposing Daniel to have prophesied at Nineveh? This is a fair sample of the criticism, by which the authenticity of the book of Daniel is called in question! It is satisfactory to find, that it is by such bold assertions as these only, that the reach of this great prophecy into fu-

* In Greek, the transition from Δαυιδ, N.T. to Δαυιδ would not be difficult. In Hebrew it is not so easily accounted for, דָּוִד, for דָּוִיָּאֵל.

† Jos. Ant. x. x. i. ‡ 2 Kings, xix. 34; viii. 19. § Job. i. 5.

turity is proposed to be set aside. Some with the view of making four empires out of three, would make Nebuchadnezzar individually to represent the first of the four empires, and his successors the second. Some, reckless of history, would divide the empire of the Medes and Persians, such as it existed after the fall of Babylon, into two distinct empires; and some again would make two kingdoms of Alexander, and his successors. All have undertaken to compress four distinct empires, so described by Daniel, within three, as distinctly recorded in history; each contradicts the other in his arrangement; and if all these inconsistent views are equally applicable to the words of the prophecy in the opinion of the writers, it is clear, without entering into further detail, that the application must be of such an extremely loose character, as to afford no such proof as we have a right to demand, that these prophecies are a mere repetition of history to the times of the Maccabees. We have neither space nor inclination to follow this miserable attempt at exposition into all its details. Dr. Pusey has conscientiously done so, after reading all the various explanations; and our own conviction, after a careful perusal of his work, is that, as far as regards the prophecy of the great symbolic image, the attempt of critics to show that the writer of the book of Daniel, in the second and seventh chapters, was describing events of history with a view to the time of Antiochus, is not only a most signal failure as an act of criticism, but that it has been simply undertaken to meet the exigencies of the foregone conclusion, that Daniel could not be a prophet.

Nevertheless, we are not disposed to quarrel with those who would endeavour to determine which are, and which are not, the genuine writings of Daniel, in the compilation bearing his name which has come down to us. And when we meet with earnest and religious-minded men, such as the late Dr. Arnold, men of esteemed character, and of approved judgment in questions of criticism in general, who have thought it their duty to take exception to a certain portion of the book, of no very great extent, as incapable of bearing any reasonable spiritual construction, and have expressed their opinions that the style and character of the composition of the part objected to is totally unlike the character of real prophecy, so beautifully exemplified in this particular book of Scripture, we cannot think it reasonable that such opinions should be impatiently set aside as worthless by the mere dictum of authority, but rather that they should be carefully weighed and examined, with the view of turning them, if possible, to profitable account.

Let it be remembered that there is much reason for believing that the book of Daniel, written not in Judea, but at Babylon, by one not trained to the prophetic office like his predecessors, but engaged in the secular affairs of two great heathen kingdoms, was not received into the canon of Scripture, as settled at Jerusalem, till long after the death of the writer : and that at the time when it was there received, as testified by the earliest Greek translation, it had become encumbered with several

questionable additions, rejected by the compiler of the Hebrew canon, and since pronounced by Protestant expositors to be apocryphal writings to which the name of Daniel had been improperly attached; and that also in defiance of the authoritative and infallible decision, to the contrary, of the Church of Rome. From the Septuagint translation, or rather paraphrase, of Daniel, we collect, that at the time of that version the hymn supposed to have been sung by the three children in the fiery furnace had become incorporated with the third chapter of some copies of the Chaldee book, as then known at Jerusalem, or Alexandria; and from a comparison of the last words of the sixth chapter of the Septuagint version with the first words of the story of Bel and the Dragon,* it may be inferred, that that legend also, though not so placed by the translator, had once been appended to the sixth chapter of the Chaldee. Traces of this junction we conceive to be still remaining in the last words of the sixth chapter as generally read: "So this Daniel prospered in the reign of Darius;"—"And in the reign of Cyrus." Where the last words would seem to have been left, as in the last verse of the second book of Chronicles, to show where the legend once joined, but which, as now read, in their fragmentary state, lead to the

* Καὶ ὁ βασιλεὺς Δαρείος προστίθη πρὸς τὸ γένος αὐτοῦ, καὶ Δανιὴλ κατετάθη ἐπὶ τῆς βασιλείας Δαρείου, καὶ Κύρος ὁ Πέρσης παρέλαβεν τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτοῦ. Sept. Dan. vi. 28.

Καὶ ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἀστυάγης προστίθη πρὸς τὰς παύσεις αὐτοῦ, καὶ παρέλαβεν Κύρος ὁ Πέρσης τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἡ Δανιὴλ συμβιωτὴς τοῦ βασιλέως, &c. Bel and the Dragon, i. 1. Walton's "Polyglot."

false assumption that Darius was the predecessor of Cyrus in Babylon. We have no hesitation in affirming, on chronological grounds alone, that the tenth and eleventh chapters, dated in the reign of Cyrus, and which now follow the ninth chapter, dated in the reign of Darius, are either misdated or misplaced, and were not originally so written or arranged by Daniel. Also, that the first verse at least of the eleventh chapter, that is to say, of the chapter specially objected to by Arnold, where "Darius the Mede" is spoken of by the writer as contemporary with, or predecessor of Cyrus, cannot possibly have been so written by the prophet himself. And we are confirmed in this opinion by the fact, that where the Hebrew text now writes "Darius," both the Septuagint and Theodotion have written "Cyrus."

We are not called upon to enter further into the question of the genuineness or otherwise of this somewhat anomalous portion of the book of Daniel, as lying beyond the proposed limits of our remarks. We will merely observe that the eleventh chapter clearly relates to the times of Antiochus Epiphanes, and differs from the ordinary style of Daniel, inasmuch as it treats rather of individual kings, than of kingdoms, of minute events, rather than of great periods of history. Yet, nevertheless, if not genuine prophecy, then is the remarkable persecution of the holy people in the days of that king nowhere, as appears to us, prophesied of in Scripture, which, at first sight, is hard to conceive. Leaving this

subject, however, as a matter for separate examination, we now hasten to the consideration of the main subject of our observations, viz., Dr. Pusey's exposition of the prophecy of the "Seventy Weeks."

Many will be disposed to decide upon the success or failure of his work by the manner in which he has executed this, the most difficult part of his undertaking. All are aware how this plainly-worded and apparently simple prophecy has been the subject of difference and controversy, even amongst those who firmly believe in its fulfilment, for a period of nearly 1700 years ; and how some of the most profound intellects which ever existed—scholars, theologians, philologists, mathematicians, and historians—have tested their powers in the endeavour to interpret it, yet hitherto confessedly without success. From the time when Josephus maintained that the Emperor Vespasian was the "anointed prince" foretold by Daniel, even to the present day, one continuous series of discordant interpretations have succeeded each other. Africanus, Clemens of Alexandria, Eusebius, among the Fathers ; the author of the "Seder Olam," and David Gantz, amongst Jewish writers ; Scaliger, Petavius, Sir I. Newton, Marsham, Blayney, Lloyd, Ussher, Marshall, Lancaster, Prideaux, Jackson, Faber, Lyall, Parker, Greswell, Galloway, Lord Arthur Hervey, Hengstenberg, Auberlen, Hofman, and Ewald, are some few of the interpreters whose works have come under the notice of the writer, in evidence of the labour and ability which has been bestowed on its solution. Some of these writers

have proposed to adopt the reading of the Septuagint translation—"Seven and Seventy"—in preference to the "Seventy" of the Hebrew; some count in lunar years, most in solar years; some commence the period with the decree of Cyrus, some with the decree of Darius of the book of Ezra, supposing that king to be Darius Nothus; some count from the seventh year of Artaxerxes Longimanus, others from the twentieth year of the same king, and some from the twentieth year of Xerxes; some terminate the "weeks" with the birth of Christ, and most with his baptism or ministry; some look upon the periods of "seven weeks," "threescore and two weeks," and "one week," as forming together a continuous period of "seventy weeks," while some would separate from the rest the "seven weeks," and others the "one week," as periods yet to be fulfilled in future time; some few maintain that the whole period of weeks should be commensurate with those actual sabbatical weeks which were commanded to be observed, and which we know were observed in Judea; and, amongst them, Dr. Pusey seems to feel the force of this restricting principle; and, lastly, not a few modern critics have arrived at the great discovery, that all this labour has been in vain, because this supposed prophecy is, in fact, merely a fiction of the days of Antiochus Epiphanes, and the period of weeks spoken of in it was fulfilled in the reign of that prince, some 170 years before the birth of Christ. Every fresh interpreter only adds to the

force of our conviction, that some fundamental error lies at the foundation of all Christian interpretations, and that until this source of error shall have been discovered, the Seventy Weeks of Daniel will continue to remain unexplained, and unexplainable, to the comprehension of any unprejudiced inquirer.

From the multitude of varying expositions thus offered to him, Dr. Pusey seems to have selected that of Prideaux, which he follows in all main particulars. We can only regret that we are unable to agree with one so earnest, and so well entitled to our attention, either in his selection or mode of treating the subject. Let us first point out one or two preliminary objections which have occurred to us in our progress through this part of the work.

One of the fundamental positions taken up by Dr. Pusey, and one without which his explanation must fall to the ground, is, that Daniel was carried captive to Babylon in the third year of Jehoiakim,* king of Judah, counted from the death of King Josiah, and *before* Nebuchadnezzar ascended the throne of Babylon; from which it is inferred that Daniel may thus have been educated in the learning of the Chaldeans for three full years, as we are told he was, and yet have interpreted the king's dream at the close of the *second* year of his reign. This position is justly objected to by Lengerke, on the ground that, if Daniel was brought to Babylon during the first year of Nebuchadnezzar,† the second

* Dan. i. 1.

† Jer. xxv. i.

year of the reign of that prince could not have fallen three years after his first.

Dr. Pusey appeals to the history of Berosus, to show that Daniel may have been one amongst those Jewish captives which Berosus tells us had been taken by Nebuchadnezzar before his father's death, and whom he ordered to be conducted to Babylon by the ordinary route, while he himself hastened over the desert to take the throne. Can anything, however, be more clear than the words of Berosus,* as quoted by Dr. Pusey,† to show that those captives, together with Daniel, if he was amongst them, arrived at Babylon *not before*, but after the accession of the king to the throne? So that, if Daniel was brought to Babylon, as we infer, "to stand in the king's palace," there to be educated for three full years in "the learning and the tongue of the Chaldeans,"‡ it is quite clear that those three years could not have been completed till the fourth year of the king's reign. And if so, it is simply impossible that Daniel, as Dr. Pusey supposes, could have interpreted the king's dream in the second year of his reign. The idea proceeds on the supposition, that Daniel interpreted the dream in the last of his three years of probation; that he had commenced his education before his arrival at Babylon; and that a siege of Jerusalem had taken place, not spoken of in the histories contained in the books of Kings or Chro-

* See Josephus cont. Apion. i. 19. † Page 60.

‡ Dan. i. 4.

nicles, and before the conquest of Pharaoh Necho, its then supreme lord. But if Daniel was thus carried away captive in the third year of Jehoiakim, and from this year, as assumed, the period of seventy years' captivity of the nation at Babylon is to be counted, how comes it to pass, that the author of the last chapter of Jeremiah, who enumerates the several occasions when captives were carried off in the reign of Nebuchadnezzar, makes no mention of this the most important captivity of all? The writer knew of no carrying away of captives from Jerusalem before the seventh year of Nebuchadnezzar, that is to say, in the very year in which Jehoiakim fell into the hands of the Babylonian king and ceased to reign.*

In agreement with Jeremiah, the writer of the second book of Chronicles, who wrote after the seventy years of captivity were ended, and when the precise limits of that period therefore were understood, makes no reference, either to this supposed important siege, or to this commencement of the captivity. He simply tells us that Jehoiakim reigned eleven years, and that "against him came up Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, and bound him with fetters to carry him to Babylon. Nebuchadnezzar also carried of the vessels of the house of the Lord, and put them in his temple at Babylon,"† evidently alluding to the same carrying away of part of the vessels, which is spoken of in the beginning of the

* Jer. lii. 28, 29, 30. † 2 Chron. xxxvi. 6, 7.

book of Daniel, as having occurred in the third year of Jehoiakim. So that the third year of this king, spoken of by Daniel, would appear to have been the same as the eleventh, or last year of Jehoiakim, mentioned in Chronicles.

Again, this view is confirmed by the writer of the second book of Kings,* who is particular in describing the sieges of Jerusalem, and informs us that Jehoiakim became servant of Nebuchadnezzar for three years, that is, for the years 5-6, 6-7, and 7-8, of the Jewish king's reign, after which he rebelled and became independent. He then reigned in independence for *three years*, that is, during the years 8-9, 9-10, and 10-11, of his entire reign, when in that eleventh year, called the *third* year of Jehoiakim by Daniel, being the seventh year of Nebuchadnezzar according to Jeremiah, he was bound in fetters to be carried to Babylon; and his successor, Jechoniah, who reigned only three months, was in the following year, or eighth of Nebuchadnezzar,† carried to Babylon, and his father slain after the first siege of the city in that king's reign.

Again, Ezekiel knows of no other commencement of the captivity at Babylon than that which began in the eighth year of Nebuchadnezzar.

Josephus reckons that Daniel was carried away even as late as the time of Zedekiah. The "*Seder Olam Rabba*," with no chronological bias, has the words, "Daniel is to be understood as speaking of the third year after the rebellion of Jehoiakim;"

* 2 Kings, xxiv. 1.

† Ibid. xxiv. 12.

and as regards the year of the interpretation of the dream,—“Scripture reckons the years from the destruction of the temple.”*

Hippolytus also considered that Daniel was carried captive, not in the third year of Jehoiakim, but at the time when Jehoiakim, son of Eliakim, that is, Jechoniah, was taken prisoner to Babylon. So also did Clement of Alexandria, Cedrenus, and many others. The strong inducement which has led Prideaux, and those who follow him, to adopt the opposite interpretation, is, the absolute necessity for adopting it, in order to obtain the semblance of a beginning for the seventy years’ “*desolations of Jerusalem*,” which we know preceded the delivery of the seventy weeks’ prophecy.† These desolations, however, are clearly marked in the second book of Chronicles,‡ as beginning with the *burning of Jerusalem*, not with the third year of Jehoiakim, when Jerusalem, so far from being desolate, had not yet even been besieged by the king of Babylon. The idea that Daniel was made captive in the third year from the accession of Jehoiakim, is simply an invention of modern days; and when disproved, the first principle upon which most modern interpretations of Daniel’s weeks are founded, falls to the ground.

With reference to the “second year of Nebuchadnezzar,” and “third year of Jehoiakim,” as spoken of by Daniel, we think we can discover the principle upon

* A translation of the “Seder Olam” will be found in Vol. ii., Part ii., of the “Transactions of the Chronological Institute.”

† Dan. ix. 2.

‡ 2 Chron. xxxvi. 19–21.

which Daniel reckoned the reigns of the successive princes of whom he writes. We know from the first words of his ninth chapter that his mind had been dwelling intently upon the prophecies of Jeremiah; and Jeremiah, we know, had foretold the coming of that "righteous branch* unto David," under whom "Judah should be saved and Israel dwell in safety:" and also spoke of a time when there should enter the gates of Jerusalem "kings and princes sitting on the throne of David, riding in chariots and on horses, they and their princes," &c., &c.† It had also already been revealed to Daniel how four successive empires, beginning with the Babylonians and the Persians, should have rule over the holy people, after which "the God of heaven should set up a kingdom never to be destroyed." "The kingdom," therefore, which occupied the thoughts of Daniel was the kingdom of David, or the kingdom of Messiah, the future seat of which kingdom should be Jerusalem. Counting, therefore, like Ezekiel, from the time of his own captivity, he first seems to mention the third of Jehoiakim as marking the date of that event, and then to have begun by reckoning the eleven years of Zedekiah till the destruction of the holy city; then the second year of Nebuchadnezzar, not from the time of his accession to the throne of Babylon, but from the time of his finally taking the government of Judea into his hands: then, again, the years of Cyrus, not from his accession to the throne of Persia or Media, but from

* Jer. xxxiii. 5, 6.

† Jer. xvii. 25.

the time when Babylon was subdued, and Judea thereby came under his dominion; and, lastly, when he says "Darius took the kingdom," he counts not from the time of the accession of Darius to the throne of Persia, but from the time of the fall of Belshazzar, when he "took the kingdom, being about threescore and two years old," and when Judea and Jerusalem came immediately under his control.

Again, Dr. Pusey abandons all hope of discovering who was the prince reigning when the prophecy of the seventy weeks was delivered to Daniel. Daniel tells us plainly enough that his master's title was Darius: that Darius reigned over kingdoms subject to the laws of the Medes and Persians, and therefore after the Medes had fallen under the power of the Persians: and that his dominions comprehended "all people, nations, and languages that dwell in all the earth."* His kingdom, therefore, would appear to have been co-extensive even with that of Cyrus, to whom "the Lord God of heaven had given all the kingdoms of the earth." Dr. Pusey, however, assumes that this king reigned before the first year of "Cyrus, king of Babylon:" that he was a subordinate prince set up by that king over Babylon, and that his title was anything but Darius. "It is a question," he observes,† "of secular, not of Biblical history, whether Cyrus placed on the throne the Cyaxares II. of Xenophon, or Astyages, or neither, but a Median

* Dan. vi. 25.

† P. 124.

descendant of the celebrated sovereign Acashwerosh, Cyaxares:" and thus he shrinks from the consideration of one of the main points necessary for determining whether the prophecy has, or has not, been fulfilled within the time foretold. If, also, the Darius of Daniel was no other than Cyaxares, son of Astyages, and, at the same time, the title Ahasuerus, as he suggests, is equivalent to the title Cyaxares, why, it may be asked, has Daniel designated the king "Darius son of Ahasuerus," and not rather Ahasuerus, son of Ahasuerus? and how does it come to pass that, in this case, the title Ahasuerus is applied both to Cyaxares and Astyages? If, as an alternative Daniel's Darius was no other than Astyages, then must Astyages, the grandfather of Cyrus, have been sixty-two years of age at the time of the taking of Babylon, just eight years before the death of his grandson, according to Dr. Pusey's reckoning, in B.C. 530, as some say, at the age of seventy, and certainly at not less than fifty years of age? In the one case both grandfather and grandson would have been of the same age at the taking of Babylon: in the other, at the respective ages of sixty-two and forty-two. Dr. Pusey is not altogether responsible for these extravagant suggestions, which seem to form the staple of most modern interpretations. His alternative "or neither," shows his distrust and distaste for such illustration: nevertheless, he wishes us to believe that this great monarch, who after the conquest of Babylon by the Persians claimed to be sovereign over "all people, nations, and languages that dwell

in all the earth," was merely a viceroy over the province Babylon, whose name was not worthy of record in secular history: thus leaving ample room for the doubts of the sceptic, whether the writer of the book of Daniel was truly acquainted with the history of the time in which he professes to have lived. We trust that no such latitude of doubt need be left to the sincere inquirer, however sceptical his turn of mind may be. Daniel knew his own master's title, and that title we have no right to doubt was Darius.

Having thus decided that the reign in which the prophecy was delivered, is according to our present knowledge, past discovery, and that the "desolations of Jerusalem" had commenced nineteen years before Jerusalem had been made desolate, Dr. Pusey proceeds to analyze the great period of Seventy Weeks, which he declares to be divided into three parts, which follow each other in succession, in the order of seven weeks, sixty and two weeks, and one week.* He then observes, that the whole period of seventy weeks, or 490 years, must necessarily terminate with the anointing of a "holy of holies," or an ALL-HOLY, that is, our Lord Jesus Christ; in which last conclusion all Christian readers will agree with him. "Seventy-seven times," he writes, "are determined upon thy people and upon thy holy city, to close the transgression, to seal up sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity;" "to bring in everlasting

* P. 170.

righteousness, and to seal up vision and prophecy, and to anoint a *Holy of holies*. These were to be the gifts of God *at the close of that seventieth week.*"* "Once in the future, *at the end of the seventy weeks*, there should be an atoning for all iniquity." Then, again, he most truly points out † that "the symbolical meaning of the anointing is fixed by the next words of the prophecy—"unto *Messiah the Prince.*" The word is repeated. The last of the six blessings was, *to anoint an All-Holy*—"limshoach kodesch kodashim." He resumes at once, "unto one Anointed, a Prince—ad *Mashiach* nagid." No one wishing to be understood, would unite so closely words relating to the same period of time, *the end of the seventy weeks*, ‡ had they not related to the same object—"to anoint an All-Holy:" "unto one Anointed." How clearly and forcibly has Dr. Pusey here set forth the true mode of interpreting the words of the prophecy in the abstract! Who will venture to gainsay his position? Could any words of his, however, have led us more logically to the conclusion, that the order of the successive periods cannot be, as above stated, $7 + 62 + 1 = 70$:

But 1 week	=	7 years
7 „	=	49 „
62 „	=	434 „
—		—
70 „	=	490 years.

For if, in the words of Daniel, "unto *Messiah the*

* P. 177. † P. 180. ‡ These last italics are our own.

Prince," or unto one Anointed a Prince, "shall be seven weeks and threescore and two weeks," that is, sixty-nine weeks, and if "the *end* of the seventy weeks," in the words of Dr. Pusey, is the time determined "to anoint an All-Holy," which is the same event, clearly no place remains for the period of "one week," except as preceding the seven and sixty-two. No interpretation of the prophecy we submit can be the true one which does not coincide with this leading principle, so clearly, though not intentionally, laid down. Again, if "seven weeks and threescore and two weeks" are thus shown to have closed at the same point of time as the "seventy," the inference is equally clear and undeniable, that all that is spoken of as about to happen, "*after threescore and two weeks*,"—viz., the cutting off of Messiah: the coming of a prince to "destroy the city and the sanctuary:" "the confirming the covenant with many for one week," and "the causing of the sacrifice and oblation to cease," must necessarily be excluded from the series of events comprehended within the Seventy Weeks. Having thus discovered the clue to the interpretation, and, as it were, with the key in hand ready to unlock the mystery, Dr. Pusey deliberately casts it away, and surrendering himself into the hands of Prideaux, proceeds to explain the words of the prophecy on a principle the reverse of that which he has himself laid down. Disappointment and perplexity alone can be the result. Let us trace the series of difficulties into which the scheme of Prideaux leads him.

The wording of the prophecy is remarkably distinct, particular, and minute. We read not only of the definite periods of "seventy," "threescore and two," "seven," and "one week," but the prophet even marks with a very prominent event the minute division, one half of a week. "In the midst of the week," or in half a week, "he shall cause the sacrifice and oblation to cease." Each of these separate divisions we must assume was intended to be fulfilled with exactness.

Nevertheless, when Dr. Pusey comes to interpret, we find that the anointing of an All-Holy, which, according to his own interpretation, ought to have taken place at the end of seventy, is actually placed by him at the baptism of Jesus Christ, when He was anointed with the Holy Ghost to preach the Gospel, at the end of precisely sixty-nine weeks,* and he is, therefore, constrained to suggest, that the Holy Spirit, maybe, "did not declare, so that it should be certainly known beforehand, the precise year when the Messiah should come, and should be cut off;"† and that "the event, which was to change and regenerate millions upon millions, was fixed beforehand, within some surplus above 483 years."‡ Fully agreeing with Dr. Pusey, that a veil of obscurity was intended to hang over this deeply spiritual prophecy, for a period, reaching far indeed beyond the time of its accomplishment, and seeing also how effectually

* P. 170.

† P. 164.

‡ P. 165.

this veil continues to be upheld even to the present day, we are yet unable to admit that any vagueness of intention can possibly be concealed under such manifest precision and minuteness of expression; nor can we believe that Dr. Pusey himself would have yielded to this suggestion, except under the extreme urgency of the position in which he is placed by his own arrangement.

Again, Dr. Pusey writes—"The date when those 490 years began is described in words which leave no large or uncertain margin, *from the going forth of a commandment to restore and rebuild Jerusalem unto Messiah the Prince.*" Why does he omit the words which immediately follow,—"*shall be seven weeks, and threescore and two weeks,*" that is, exactly 483, *not* 490 years? The confusion thus introduced is extreme. For having already shown that the periods of sixty-nine weeks, and of seventy weeks, must necessarily have ended together with the same event, viz., the "anointing of an All-Holy," and the coming of "one Anointed," at the *end* of the seventieth week, he is here endeavouring to show how the same periods of sixty-nine, and seventy weeks, must also have begun at the same point, viz., "the going forth of the commandment to restore and rebuild Jerusalem," and how the anointing of Messiah, the All-Holy, took place not at the end of the seventieth, but of the sixty-ninth week: two different propositions which cannot coincide.

The fact is, that Dr. Pusey, being unable to show how the successive "periods of 49, 434, and $3\frac{1}{2}$ years

twice repeated," in all 490 years, ended with the anointing of an All-Holy, which is what he sets out to prove, proposes to combine this arrangement, correct in principle, as pointing out the final event which marks the 490th year, though not so fulfilled, with another arrangement, said indeed to have been fulfilled, though wholly incorrect in principle, which places the anointing at the end of 49, and 434 years, and the termination of the whole period at the end of a further term of $3\frac{1}{2}$ years, once only fulfilled, "not twice repeated," in all $486\frac{1}{2}$ years: thus making the redundancy of years in one scheme supply the deficiency of years in the other: and in the fulness of his conviction that the prophecy has in some way been fulfilled, he allows himself to describe and hold up this combination of inconsistencies for admiration, as "completeness of symmetry" and "complicated harmony."* If it were lawful to interpret the words "anointed" and "anointing" in two different senses in the same prophecy, that is to say, by ending the sixty-nine weeks with the anointing of Messiah to the priesthood, as Dr. Pusey proposes, and by ending the seventy weeks by anointing Messiah to the burial, as proposed by Dr. Prideaux, a certain sort of symmetry might indeed thus be produced, by the combination of two different interpretations. But any such complication is distinctly forbidden by the precise words of the prophecy, "unto Messiah the Prince,"

* P. 188.

not "unto Messiah the Priest," from which it is clear that "to anoint" has reference, neither to the priesthood or ministry, nor to the burial or sacrifice of Messiah, but distinctly, and undeniably, to His *birth* as "Prince" of the house of David, and to His anointing to the kingdom, and that only.

Thus far regarding Dr. Pusey's exposition of the main period of 490 years. Can anything we ask be more confused and indistinct? We now proceed to consider how the minor periods of seven, sixty-two, and one week, are treated by him.

Dr. Pusey places the commencement of the $7 + 62$ or sixty-nine weeks, that is, of the period of 483 years, "unto Messiah," in the year B.C. 458-7, or 457-6, about the seventh year of the reign of Artaxerxes Longimanus, when Ezra is said to have received his commission to re-establish at Jerusalem the laws and institutions of the Jews; and ends this period with the baptism of our Lord in A.D. 26, and the whole period of seventy weeks in A.D. 33. This arrangement, however, is simply impossible, because it places the baptism of Christ in the thirteenth year of Tiberius, and thereby sets at nought the exact record of St. Luke, who fixes the baptism in the fifteenth year, and thus puts an end to this interpretation. Neither the beginning nor the ending of this period of 483 years can be satisfactorily accounted for by this arrangement. For if our Lord was baptized in the fifteenth year of Tiberius, A.D. 28, which few would now be disposed to deny, then was the seventh year of Artaxerxes too early for the beginning. If

the seventh of Artaxerxes was the beginning, then was the ending, A.D. 28, out of time. So that neither the period of 490 years, nor that of 483, is capable of any secure or satisfactory solution, nor do the two periods terminate, as they ought, and as Dr. Pusey has determined, at the same point of time.

Again, Dr. Pusey places the crucifixion in A.D. 29, and thus is in difficulty concerning the surplus of three years and a half, after the death of Christ, which, according to his view, yet remain to complete the seventieth week in A.D. 33: while the fact of the existence of this surplus distinctly nullifies his leading principle, that the "seventy weeks," and also the sixty-nine weeks, terminate with the anointing of an All-Holy, that is to say, either with the birth, ministry, or death of Christ.

Dr. Pusey well observes,* "Every word in this condensed prophecy has its place and meaning, and the division (7 + 62) would be unmeaning, unless something were assigned to this first portion." The text does assign it. It says, "The street shall be built again, and the wall," and that "in troublous times." Nevertheless, he is so much at a loss how to fix upon any precise event by which to mark the termination of this first portion of "seven weeks," or 49 years,—a most significant period in Jewish reckoning, and one which to the ear of every Jew would naturally recall the remembrance of the

* P. 172.

period of Jubilee, within which we know that the whole series of institutions in the Jewish Church, now about to be restored, were appointed to run their course,—that he is induced to say, “*De minimis non curat lex.*” “When the whole distance is spanned over, it matters not whether we can make out some lesser details.”* Few, we think, will be disposed to rest content with such a mode of dealing with this most significant period. He does, indeed, endeavour to account for it, by inferring that Ezra and Nehemiah may have consumed upwards of forty-five years in restoring the Jewish polity, supposed to be figuratively referred to in the prophecy by the expression, building of the “street” and the “wall.” But the only proof brought forward in support of this opinion, and for thus lengthening the duration of Nehemiah’s administration, is, what would appear to be a mere perversion of the words of Nehemiah. For, he assumes that in Nehem. xiii. 28, Joiada, the son of Eliashib, not Eliashib himself, is there spoken of as high-priest,† a point which we believe to be untenable, and without which his reckoning falls to the ground. The prophecy, as usual, is distinct enough, and plainly points to the building of “the wall” of Jerusalem as marking the completion of the period.

* P. 171.

† “And one of the sons of Joiada, the son of Eliashib, the high-priest, was son-in-law to Sanballat.” If the title high-priest does not here apply to Eliashib, it must apply to the son of Joiada, not to Joiada himself.

The interpretation again rests upon forced and uncertain grounds.

Another fatal objection to Dr. Pusey's exposition, in our opinion, as also to most modern interpretations, with one great exception, that of Sir Isaac Newton, is, that the period of "seven weeks" cannot be made to tally with so many Sabbatical weeks, ending with a Jubilee, as reckoned at Jerusalem after the return from captivity. It is undoubtedly true that Ezra restored the computation and observance of the Sabbatical years, and that the forty-ninth year, counted from his supposed arrival at Jerusalem in autumn, B.C. 458, would end in autumn 408, at the end of a Sabbatical year. But no one can point out any event which took place in that year to mark the year of Jubilee; while, on the other hand, we know that the marking of the boundaries of the walls of walled cities was one of the express duties to be performed in the year of Jubilee;* as also the revision of the genealogies, as stated by Michaelis and Ewald,† both which duties were undertaken by Nehemiah at the time of the dedication of the wall of Jerusalem. Dr. Prideaux openly declares his inability to produce correspondence between the weeks of Daniel and the Sabbatical years and Jubilees of

* *Seder Olam Rabba*, ch. xxx. Dwelling-houses within the walls, and beyond the walls, were differently treated in the year of Jubilee. (Levit. xxv. 29, 30.) Therefore the boundaries had to be ascertained at the end of every forty-nine years.

† Smith's *Dict.*, note on word "Jubilee."

the Jews, and therefore pronounces the latter to be "useless, because they help not to the explaining anything either in the Holy Scriptures or the histories of the times" of which he treats.* He places the death of Christ, and the causing of the sacrifice and oblation to cease, at the conclusion of the last week, instead of "in the midst of the (last) week." Dr. Pusey, by arbitrarily placing the death of Christ in A.D. 29, one year only after the true date of his baptism, according to St. Luke, proposes to obviate this difficulty, but thereby falls into one equally inadmissible, viz., of completing the events in sixty-nine weeks and a half, instead of seventy weeks, and contradicting his principal authority. We submit that no interpretation can be the true one which does not conform to most, if not to all, of the following plain propositions :—

Daniel, ix. 1, 2.

In the first year of Darius, son of Ahasuerus, of the seed of the Medes, what time he was made king over the realm of the Chaldeans, in the first year of his reign, I, Daniel, understood by books the number of the years whereof the word of the Lord came to Jeremiah the prophet, that he would accomplish seventy years in the desolations of Jerusalem.

1. That the prophecy was delivered in the reign of a king known to Daniel only by the title Darius.

2. That this Darius, called "son of Ahasuerus," or Cyaxares, "of the seed of the Medes," may have been son, or grandson, by birth, adoption, inherit-

* Prideaux's Connec.: Pref. p. xvi.

ance, ancestral descent in male or female line, son-in-law,* or simply successor† to the throne of this Median king.

3. That this Darius reigned over 120 provinces, comprising "all people, nations, and languages, which dwell in all the earth:" and was, therefore, no subordinate king set over a limited portion of the empire of some greater king. (Dan. vi. 25.)

4. That the dominions of Darius were subject to "the laws of the Medes and Persians;" and that he "took the kingdom" of the Chaldeans when it passed from the hands of Belshazzar to the Persians (U-Pharsin). Dan. v. 25-31.

5. That the prophecy was delivered when Jerusalem had been *desolate* for nearly seventy years; and therefore not earlier than the reign of Darius, son of Hystaspes, who, according to any reasonable reckoning, was on the throne in the seventieth year after the destruction and desolation of that city, and who, therefore, unless two mighty kings, bearing the same title, reigned at the same time, was the Darius known to Daniel.

6. That Darius was "about threescore and two years old" when the prophecy was delivered; and since Darius, son of Hystaspes, died at the age of seventy-two,‡ it was delivered about ten years before his death, and not earlier therefore than B.C. 495.

7. That the second year of Darius, "what time

* 1 Sam. xxiv. 16.

† 1 Chron. iii. 16.

‡ Ctesias Frag.: Muller, p. 49.

he was made king over the realm of the Chaldeans," was a year of profound peace throughout the then known world. (Zech. i. 11.)

8. That it was not till this "second year," when Darius was about sixty-three years old, that the "*indignation*" against Jerusalem ceased, (Zech. i. 1-12), and the words of reconciliation were uttered, "I am returned to Jerusalem with mercies: my house shall be built in it, saith the Lord of hosts, and a line shall be stretched forth on Jerusalem." (Zech. i. 16.)

9. That it was not therefore till after *seventy* years of "*desolation*" and *seventy* years of "*indignation*" against Jerusalem had ceased, that the reckoning of seventy weeks of mercy on that city could have begun.

Verse 24.

Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people and thy holy city, to finish the transgression, and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to anoint a holy of holies.

10. That these "seventy weeks" are weeks of years, or seventy "Sabbaths of years," each ending with a shemittah, or year of release, such as were commanded to be observed by the Levitical law. (Lev. xxv. 1-8.)

11. That the end of these seventy weeks is marked by the anointing of "a holy of holies;" that is, literally, of the most holy portion of the sanctuary of the Jewish temple; but here applied figuratively to the "Holy of Holies" of the Spi-

ritual Church of Christ, that is, to the most holy portion of that spiritual temple "of which Jesus Christ is the chief corner-stone," "in whom we also are builded together as a habitation of God through the Spirit," (Eph. ii. 20-22,) to the "Redeemer, the holy one of Israel," (Isaiah, xlviii. 17.)

Verse 25.

Know, therefore, and understand, that from the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem, unto Messiah, the Prince, shall be seven weeks, and threescore and two weeks: the street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times.

12. That this period of "seven weeks" represents a period of "seven Sabbaths of years," or "forty and nine years," ending with a year of Jubilee. (Lev. xxv. 8-9.) And also ending with the dedication of the wall of Jerusalem.

13. That these "seven weeks," and "threescore and two weeks," end with the coming of "one Anointed, a Prince:" and that this anointed Prince is he who is before spoken of as the "Holy of Holies" of Christ's spiritual temple.

14. That "to anoint," therefore, has reference neither to the time of the burial, nor of the ministry of the Anointed one, but expressly to the time of his birth as Prince, and of his consecration to the kingdom of his father David.

15. That, if the "seventy weeks," and "the seven and threescore and two weeks," both end together in the birth of the Anointed, the remaining one week

must necessarily precede the seven, and threescore and two, thus $1 + 7 + 62 = 70$.

16. That, if the "threescore and two weeks" end with the "seventy," all that is spoken of as occurring "after threescore and two weeks," must necessarily be excluded from what is comprised within the seventy.

17. That the "commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem" has reference to "the commandment of Cyrus," of whom it was foretold that he should "say to Jerusalem, Thou shalt be built, and to the temple, Thy foundation shall be laid," (Isaiah, xliv. 28), which commandment was reissued, and first put in execution, in the fourth, fifth, or sixth year of Darius, when Artaxerxes was associated on the throne with Darius (Ezra, vi. 14; Herodotus, vii. 1-4).

18. That Jesus of Nazareth, "of the house and lineage of David," was born about thirty years before the fifteenth year of Tiberius, and therefore either in the year 3 or 2 B.C.

Verse 26.

And after threescore and two weeks Messiah (the Prince) shall be cut off, and (the kingdom shall be) not to him:* and the people of the prince that shall come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary, and the end thereof shall be with a flood, and unto the end of the war desolations are determined.

19. That these words refer to the death of

* "And there is none to help him."—*Translation of Dr. Benisch.*

Messiah the Prince, the invasion of Judea by Vespasian and Titus, the destruction of the city and temple of Jerusalem, and the continuation of the war till the whole land should become desolate. (Mark, xiii. 14.)

Verse 27.

And he shall confirm the covenant with many for one week, and in the midst of the week he shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease, and for the overspreading of abominations he shall make it desolate, even until the consummation, and that determined shall be poured upon the desolate.

20. That the "covenant" here confirmed "with many" is the two-fold covenant made with Abraham: — 1st. That in his seed, that is, in Messiah, "shall all the nations of the earth be blessed." 2nd. That to Abraham and his seed after him shall be given all the land of Canaan as "an everlasting possession." (Gen. xxii. 18; xvii. 7, 8.) The "covenant and mercy," for the fulfilment of which Daniel prayed. (Dan. ix. 4; Luke, i. 72, 73.)

21. That, "for one week," has reference, figuratively, to the Sabbatical week, A.D. 27–34, or seven years of covenant, from the preaching of the kingdom of the Messiah by John to the Jews, until the calling of the Gentiles in Cornelius: literally, to the Sabbatical week, A.D. 65–72, or seven years of covenant, during which the Jews partially regained possession of the promised land of Canaan, and resisted the power of the Romans.

22. That the "causing of the sacrifice and

oblation to cease," "in the midst of the week," has reference, figuratively, to the death of Messiah, in A.D. 32 : literally, to the ceasing of the morning and evening sacrifice and oblation, on the seventeenth of Panemus, or Tamuz, A.D. 70. (Jos. Bell. Jud. l. vi. c. 2.)

23. That, "until the consummation," has reference to the time "when he shall have accomplished to scatter the power of the holy people," and to the time when Jerusalem shall cease to be trodden down by the Gentiles. (Dan. xii. 7; Luke, xxi. 24-27).

Now, if the foregoing propositions have been fairly deduced from the words of Daniel and elsewhere, then is it clear, that there is scarcely one single principle of interpretation which has not either been violated, or overlooked, in Dr. Pusey's exposition. 1. The Darius of Daniel is identified either with Cyaxares, or Astyages, or with some yet unheard-of king. 2. The prophecy is supposed to have been delivered at the end of *fifty*, not of seventy years of "*desolation*," at Jerusalem. This period of desolation is spoken of as a period of "*captivity*,"* not of "*desolation*;" and the years of captivity are counted from a point eight years earlier than any captivity spoken of by Jeremiah or Ezekiel. 3. Darius is supposed to be a mere viceroy under Cyrus, not a king. 4. He comes to the throne in a time of wars, and conquests, not at a

* P. 162.

time of profound peace. 5. The age of Darius, one of the special marks of time recorded by Daniel for our guidance, is not in any way brought to bear on the prophecy. 6. Darius is supposed to be a Mede, and not a Persian. 7. The events of the prophecy are comprehended within sixty-nine weeks and a half, instead of seventy. 8. The three periods comprised within the seventy weeks are placed in the order of $7 + 62 + 1 = 70$: instead of $1 + 7 + 62 = 70$. 9. The events spoken of as occurring *after* this last period of sixty-two weeks, are supposed to have taken place *before* the expiration of that period. 10. The baptism of Christ is placed two years earlier than it is fixed by St. Luke. 11. The "seventy weeks" are not Sabbatical weeks. 12. The "seven weeks" cannot be made to coincide with a period of Jubilee, nor to end with the completion of the wall of Jerusalem. 13. Unto Messiah the Prince is made to signify unto Messiah the Priest. 14. "The commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem" is not fulfilled by the restoration of the literal "street" and "wall," nor applicable to the decree of Cyrus, commanding the restoration of the literal city; but to a decree, said to have been fulfilled in a figurative building of the street and wall, that is, by the restoration of the Jewish polity in Judea.

Thus are the distinctness and precision of Daniel's words departed from almost at every step, in this, the most recent of Christian interpretations: and such is the approved mode of interpreta-

tion entertained by one of the most esteemed and eminent of Christian writers of the present day, concerning a prophecy upon which the momentous doctrine of Jesus of Nazareth as the Messiah is chiefly founded. The Jew has too much ground for observing, "that those who will examine the books of the Nazarenes will find, that there is nothing clearly known amongst them concerning either the beginning or the ending of the weeks,—one placing them here, another there : and that there is no agreement between them as to the date of the crucifixion of Jesus of Nazareth." *

But if it is incumbent upon Christians to make plain before the world the manner in which they consider that this remarkable prophecy has been fulfilled in the person of Jesus of Nazareth, whom they worship as the Messiah here foretold,—in which, it must be admitted that they have not yet been successful, except in the eyes of willing believers,—how much more is it imperative upon "God's holy people," to whom this divine oracle was originally delivered, whose faith and hope is centred in the doctrine of a Messiah, to tell us plainly in what rational way, and by whom, they conceive that the coming and cutting off of "One Anointed, a Prince," at the expiration of 490 years after the delivery of this heavenly message to Daniel, can have been accomplished, if not in the person of Him who was born, as we shall see, at the very

* *Munimen Fidei* of Rab. Isaac, p. 342.

time appointed, of the seed of Abraham, of the house and lineage of David, concerning whom, at His birth, it was declared, "The Lord God shall give unto Him the throne of His father David,"* of whom, during His ministry, the officers of the chief priests and Pharisees testified, "Never man spake like this man,"† and who, at the close of a pure and spotless life, condemned to die, when solemnly adjured by the high-priest to declare whether he were "the Christ the Son of God," replied, "*Thou hast said*. Nevertheless, I say unto you, Hereafter shall ye see the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of Power, and coming in the clouds of heaven." If they cannot explain when, and by whom, this prophecy has been accomplished, then we would inquire what is the present state of Israel's belief as regards these words of Daniel. Let us examine a few of the interpretations which have been put forth by the Jews themselves in contrast with those of Christian expositors, with the view either of explaining or of avoiding the force of the prediction.

In the "Seder Olam Rabba," one of their oldest comments, we read :—"The seven weeks are those which they passed in exile until they went up," that is, to Jerusalem. "The sixty-two weeks are those in which they remained in the land of Israel after their return. But, one week, is that in which they were partly in the land, and partly out of the land."

Again, we read :—"Rabbi Jose teaches us that

* Luke, i. 32.

† John, vii. 45-46.

the seventy weeks are to be reckoned from the destruction of the first temple to that of the latter one by the Romans. That is to say, seventy years during which it remained broken down and destroyed, and 420 during which it stood when rebuilt. But what do you mean by seventy weeks, when seventy years of the destruction had already been accomplished? It may be truly said that that decree had been ordained seventy years before.”*

The explanation of David Gantz is to the same effect. For, after referring to the passage in Isaiah, where Cyrus is spoken of as Messiah, or Anointed: “Thus saith the Lord to his Messiah Cyrus,” &c. he adds; “In the first year of Cyrus the Lord stirred up his spirit to build the house of his sanctuary; and Zerubbabel and the captivity went up to Jerusalem. But when the building ceased to go on, Daniel, amazed and perplexed, says, ‘I, Daniel, knew by books the number of the years whereof the word of the Lord came to Jeremiah the prophet, that he would accomplish seventy years in the desolations of Jerusalem.’ The angel replies to him, ‘Seventy sevens are cut out upon thy people,’ &c., from which we learn, that the seventy years were to be computed from the captivity of Zedekiah, and the destruction of the temple, not from the captivity of Daniel.” †

Rabbi Isaac, son of Abraham, in an able treatise

* “Seder Olam Rabba,” chap. xxviii.

† David Gantz, “Zemach David,” p. 52.

against Christianity, dwells much and forcibly upon the future state of calm and peacefulness which, according to Isaiah and other prophets, shall mark the time of the kingdom of Messiah—when “the wolf shall lie down with the lamb,” and when “the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord as the waters cover the sea;”^{*} and contrasting this state of peace and happiness with the strifes and contentions which have existed, now for 1800 years, since the coming of Jesus of Nazareth, who declared that He came “not to send peace, but a sword,”[†]—strongly urges that Jesus therefore cannot be the Messiah. He accordingly thus explains away the weeks of Daniel,—“Seventy weeks are 490 years, and this is the number of years which elapsed between the destruction of the first temple and the destruction of the second. Thus seventy years were fulfilled by the people in captivity at Babylon, and during 420 years the second temple was standing.”[‡]

Again, “The first period of seven weeks, or 49 years, was fulfilled from the desolation of the first temple to the beginning of the building of the second, which took place in the first year of Cyrus, king of Persia. For Cyrus was called anointed prince, where Esaias, chap. xlv., writes, ‘Thus saith the Lord to his anointed Cyrus,’—‘He shall build the city,’” &c.[§]

^{*} Isa. ii. 4; xi. 9.

[†] Matt. x. 34.

[‡] Rabbi Isaac's “Munimen Fidei,” chap. xlii. p. 333.

[§] Ibid. p. 338.

Such has been the mode of interpretation propounded by learned and devout Jews of days now gone by. These interpretations are one and the same, more or less fully expressed. Our Jewish brethren, it appears, have been willing, at least in former days, to accept Cyrus, king of Persia, the heathen prince, as that "Anointed One," whose coming and cutting off holds so conspicuous a place in the sublime prophecies of Daniel. They have persuaded themselves to believe, that the seventy weeks of mercy on the holy city were fulfilled between the destruction of the first and second temple; and would have us to agree with them, that the second temple, built by the hands of Zerubbabel, in the days of Darius, stood for exactly 420 years, till its final destruction by Titus. Even the learned Maimonides has fallen into these untenable opinions.*

It would be waste of time to enter on a refutation of opinions, which must now be looked upon merely as remnants of a dark age of literature, and which are probably regarded by Jews themselves as obsolete. No enlightened Jew of the present day, we presume, will uphold such plainly erroneous reckoning. He is too well instructed in history to deny that 490 years, counted from the destruction of Jerusalem by the Babylonians, must have ended many more than a hundred years before the destruction of the holy city by the Romans, and too well exercised in judgment to

* Maimonides "de Shemitha et Jubileo," cap. x.

maintain, that the period marked out by Daniel as to elapse "From the going forth of the commandment to *restore* and to *build* Jerusalem, unto Messiah the Prince," can have begun with the going forth of the command of Nebuchadnezzar to *burn* and to *destroy* that city, or have ended with the decree of Cyrus to restore and to build the city, with which apparently it should have commenced.

Thus, then, both Jew and Christian, though devoutly earnest in their belief in the Divine revelations of Holy Scripture, and firm in their conviction that this special prophecy of the "seventy weeks" has been, and must have been, in some way fulfilled before their eyes in days long past, are yet unable, either of them, to satisfy the other of the time or mode of its accomplishment. While every impartial inquirer, looking on upon the controversy, is compelled to admit, that both Jew and Christian, in their interpretations, have departed much from the strict words of the prophecy, and that, if such are the only explanations which can be offered, the prophecy apparently has never been fulfilled.

How remarkable and interesting is the attitude of these two steadfast, earnest "witnesses" of God, now that the days of ignorance are past, standing forward in the light of day and testifying in truth and sincerity of heart concerning this their common article of faith—their belief in a Messiah. There lies the humble and devoted Christian, prostrate in love and adoration at the feet of his crucified Lord, filled with the conviction that in Him, and Him alone, is

to be found that promised offspring of the woman, that "seed of Abraham," that "rod out of the stem of Jesse," on whom the Spirit of the Lord should rest,* and by and through whom all the nations of the earth are, and shall be, blessed. And there erect beside him stands unmoved the firm and steadfast Jew, refusing to recognise in Him thus dying on the cross, one single feature of that glorious Messiah promised to him and his forefathers; acknowledging no trace of fulfilment through Jesus of Nazareth of that covenant with Abraham, that his seed should possess the land of Canaan as an everlasting possession, or of that covenant with David, "There shall not fail thee a man in my sight to sit on the throne of Israel:"† no similitude, during 1800 long, weary years of insult and oppression, of those days of peace and rest which surely mark the time of the kingdom of Messiah: no sign or symptom of the mode in which the words of the holy Simeon shall be accomplished, that this Jesus of Nazareth, who has indeed, according to the promise, been a Light to lighten the Gentiles, shall yet also be the glory of God's people Israel. Again, we change the scene, and behold the Priests and Pharisees of Christ's Gentile church, arrayed in robes, absorbed in rites, each in his little synagogue putting on the air of God's high-priest, pointing with scorn to the temple, which is cast down, to Jerusalem, which is trodden under foot, to sacrifices which have ceased,

* Isaiah, xi. 1.

† 1 Kings, viii. 25.

to the ceremonial law which is extinct, and loudly proclaiming that the sons of Abraham, though once the loved and chosen of God, are now cast off for ever for their unbelief; and that should they ever hereafter acquire footing in the land of promise, it will probably be only as "preparing the way of Anti-Christ"* on earth. While the Jew, on the other hand, bowed down with grief and shame, smites on his breast saying, "God be merciful to me a sinner;" and weeping amid the stones of Zion, points to the Word of God, which cannot lie, and says, that temple shall be restored on a scale exceeding what has ever yet been seen;† to the word of Jesus Himself, "Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles," (but only) "until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled;" to the holy prophets, who, when the land shall be divided again for inheritance, speak of the burnt-offerings, and meat-offerings, and peace-offerings, which the Prince shall give to make reconciliation for the house of Israel;‡ of the going up, from year to year, of every one that is left of

* Pusey's "Daniel," p. 189.

† Tobit, xiv. 5. "For I surely believe those things which Jonas the prophet spake, That Jerusalem shall be desolate, and the house of God in it shall be burned, and shall be desolate in it for a time; and that again God will have mercy on them and bring them again into the land, where they shall build a temple, but not like to the first, until the time of that age be fulfilled; and afterward they shall return from all places of their captivity, and build up Jerusalem gloriously, and the house of God shall be built in it for ever."

‡ Ezek. xlv. 17.

all the nations which came against Jerusalem, to worship the King, the Lord of Hosts, and to keep the feast of the tabernacles ;* and still once more to the emphatic words of Jeremiah—"If my covenant be not with day and night, and if I have not appointed the ordinances of heaven and earth, then will I cast away the seed of Jacob, and David my servant, so that I will not take any of his seed to be rulers of the seed of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob."† Again, he looks around at Christianity as exercised in Christendom, and points to the doctrines and practices of that chief and most prominent body of professing Christians, who in the eyes of their protesting brethren are chargeable with superstition and idolatry, and believing in his heart that such practices are still displeasing in the sight of God, and conscious of his mission, declares with boldness that "the heathenish elements in Christianity are destined to be eliminated through Judaism, to be cast off, and buried in the sea of oblivion for ever." ‡

The Christian appeals with pride and triumph to the superior purity and excellence of the precepts of Jesus, his Messiah, as compared with those of Moses. The Jew, hard pressed, admits their excellence and purity, but only as refinements upon what had been already delivered to Moses and the

* Zech. xiv. 16.

† Jer. xxxiii. 25, 26.

‡ "Question at issue between Judaism and Christianity," by Dr. Benisch, p. 5.

prophets, and in reply dwells with keenness upon the impracticable nature of these precepts, pronouncing that any society attempting literally to act up to them in spirit and in truth could not long be self-maintained. This modern weapon of Judaism against Christianity is too curious and remarkable to be passed over without observation. We produce it in the words of the learned and estimable Jew before quoted. Speaking of a perfect Christian he writes :—

“As a faithful disciple of Jesus he would, were he born to riches, give them all to the poor, reduce himself to beggary, deprive himself of all the influence and advantages which wealth bestows, would promote pauperism, and assist in bringing on mankind all those evils which social economy so clearly proves to be the consequence of mendicancy. Were he a magistrate or judge on the bench, he would, instead of pronouncing sentence on the culprit, declare, ‘Let him that is guiltless cast the first stone,’ and permit the offender to escape, with a paternal admonition to sin no more. Were he a prime minister, he would tamely submit to an insult from a foreign power rather than vindicate the honour of his country by severe measures, since a perfect Christian is not allowed to resent harsh terms, and is only to employ gentle words. Were he a general, he would throw away the sword before the battle, as the effusion of blood does not become a soldier of the Prince of Peace. Were he a wayfarer, he would have to present his inner garment to the robbers just stripping him of the outer one. Were he assailed, he would have humbly to ask the ruffian for an additional blow on the cheek spared the infliction. Is it necessary to dilate upon the state of a society consisting of such perfect Christians? The Italian proverb, that he that makes himself a lamb will be devoured by the wolf, would soon be exemplified.” *

Now it cannot be said, with justice to our Jew-

* “Christianity and Judaism,” p. 14.

ish brethren, that truth lies only on one side of this picture. We are compelled to believe with them that the glorious Messiah of the prophets has not yet appeared in glory, and that the promised peace and happiness of His kingdom have not yet been established upon earth. And yet, consistently with this admission, we believe, and ask our Jewish brother to believe, that "this same Jesus which was taken up from us into heaven, shall so come in like manner as He was seen to go into heaven," and that "like a Son of Man" He shall be seen hereafter "coming in the clouds of heaven," with power and great glory to establish that kingdom for which our brother so long and patiently has waited. We believe that the Jew has too truly pointed out the Pagan element which lurks in the religion of Christendom, though not in Christianity, and that Christianity has yet to be relieved from these lingering corruptions through Judaism in the West, as it was relieved from similar corruptions by Mahomedanism in the East. We agree with him that the transcendent purity of Christ's precepts are incompatible with the present government of the kingdoms of this world, and also that they are, and can be, practised only by the few. But we also remember the words of Christ, "My kingdom now is not of this world;" my precepts now are not acceptable to "the children of the kingdom," who are cast out.* The code of laws which issued from Mount Sinai, and which by means of Christi-

* Matt. viii. 12.

anity has been effectually spread over and enforced in all quarters of the world, is yet but too well adapted to the corrupt and degraded state of man; yet, nevertheless, no argument in reason can be drawn from thence, that the purity and refinement of the religion of Jesus is not that of the kingdom of Messiah. Far be it from the "holy people," chosen from amongst the nations of the world to be a nation of pure and holy priests, to say to Him that calls them, Thy precepts are too pure and holy. What is the nature of the kingdom for which our brethren seek? Is it not a kingdom of peace and perfect love? Are we not told that in that kingdom the swords are ploughshares, spears are pruning-hooks; that "they shall neither hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain?" Are not, then, the precepts of Jesus the very essence and constitution of such a kingdom as this? Shall they not prevail when "the kingdom under the whole heaven shall be given to the saints of the Most High"? Now the Lord Jesus declared expressly that He was sent unto "the lost sheep of the house of Israel," to preach "the gospel of the kingdom of God," saying, "The kingdom of heaven is at hand." Will Israel, then, be content to resign the holy office to which she has been called, and for which apparently she has been so long preserved, when now the onward progress of mankind has again commenced its rapid course? Yea, rather, let her wake to a sense of her own proud position, let her deck herself in the garments of the loved and chosen bride, and, casting

herself down in the spirit of prayer and supplication, confess, that the kingdom of the Messiah whom she seeks is indeed a kingdom of "love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance;"* that such a kingdom could have been announced and preached only by Messiah Himself, and that, though such precepts are yet far removed above the practice of the millions of this earth, they are still within the reach and practice of the select and holy few to whom the kingdom shall be given; when the Son of Man, if there be truth in His words, shall again "drink of the fruit of the vine" with His disciples, ruling over the twelve tribes of Israel, when many "shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven," and when, through the medium of "the children of the kingdom" and the example of his "holy ones," the whole race of mankind shall gradually be brought into union with their Maker, and become "the sons of God." Once, then, we submit to our brethren, has Messiah come in humility to His own, to be rejected; once again, we trust, He shall come to reign *with them* in glory. "Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion; shout, O daughter of Jerusalem; behold, thy King cometh unto thee: He is just, and having salvation; lowly, and riding upon an ass, and upon a colt, the foal of an ass."†

* Gal. v. 22.

† Zech. ix. 9. We read in the Talmud concerning this passage (Talm. Bab. Sanhedrin, fol. 98, col. 1), "R. Joshua, the son

Let Israel hearken to the deep pathetic words of Him who, seated thus upon the colt, and coming towards Jerusalem amid the acclamations of the multitude, "when he beheld the city, wept over it, saying, If thou hadst known, even thou, at least in this thy day, the things which belong unto thy peace! but now they are hid from thine eyes. For the days shall come upon thee, that thine enemies shall cast a trench about thee, and compass thee round, and keep thee in on every side, and shall lay thee even with the ground, and thy children within thee; and they shall not leave in thee one stone upon another; because thou knewest not the time of thy visitation."* Let her also hearken to His words of promise, "Verily I say unto you, ye shall not see me, until the time come, when ye shall say, Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord."†

And when the Son of Man shall thus appear again in glory with his saints, and when "his feet shall stand in that day on the Mount of Olives,"‡ we would ask those who look malignantly upon any future attempt of the "holy people" to regain pos-

of Levi, objects that it is written in one place, 'Behold, one like a son of man came with the clouds of heaven;' but in another place it is written, 'Lowly, and riding upon an ass.' The solution is, if they be righteous, He shall come with the clouds of heaven. If they be not righteous, He shall come lowly and upon an ass." Saadiah Gaon, interpreting the words of Daniel, "One like a Son of Man," &c., says, "This is the Messiah our righteousness. But is it not written of the Messiah, 'Lowly, and riding upon an ass?' Yes, but this shows that He will come in humility, and not in pride upon horses."—Quoted in Dr. M'Caul's translation of David Kimchi's "Commentary on Zechariah," p. 93.

* Luke, xix. 41-44. † Luke, xiii. 35. ‡ Zech. xiv. 4.

session of their land, as leading to and preparing the way for Anti-Christ, of whom does the prophet speak at the time of this second coming—of Jews, or of Gentiles—when he says in the name of the Lord, “I will pour upon *the inhabitants of Jerusalem* the spirit of grace and supplication, and they shall look upon me whom they have pierced?” Of whom is that “third part” composed, of Jews, or of Gentiles, of which it is said, “They shall call upon my name, and I will hear them; I will say, It is my people; and they shall say, The Lord is my God?”* If not of Gentiles, but of Jews, why this jealous feeling concerning their restoration to their own land? Does it not savour of the spirit of Anti-Christ himself, to entertain so bitter enmity against those of whom it is thus declared that they shall become again the people of the Lord, and that indeed in Jerusalem itself?†

We now pass on to another earnest class of interpreters of the book of Daniel—those who would allow of no special providence of the Creator over the affairs of this world; who consider that all things in nature are regulated by fixed and undeviating laws, from which they cannot swerve; and that miracle, inspiration, and prophecy are, therefore, out of place, if not wholly inconsistent with a perfect system of organisation. The plainness and precision of the prophecy of the “seventy weeks” is naturally a source of trouble to these philosophers. The words of prophecy may in some cases be ingeniously ex-

* Zech. xii. 10; xiii. 9.

† xii. 6.

plained away and declared to be no prophecy at all : it may be alleged in others that opportunity has been open to the prophet of retouching his own words, and of adapting them more pointedly to events after they have come to pass : and, again, it may be contended that certain historical parts of Scripture have been so disarranged and misplaced as to bear the appearance of prophecy, which does not really belong to them. No such allegations, however, are applicable to this one central and most momentous prophecy of all contained in Scripture. No one ventures to deny that the writer of the words of this prophecy, whether he be Daniel or not, existed more than a century and a half before the birth of Christ ; no one calls in question, to any material effect, the integrity of the text ; and no one can fail to admit the plainness, precision, and freedom from ambiguity of all its expressions.

If, then, the words of Daniel can be shown to have reference to, and to have been fulfilled, with unmistakeable exactness, in connexion with the person of that Being who for 1800 years past has been looked upon by millions as the "Anointed One" here spoken of, so signal an instance of inspiration and of prophecy will have been exhibited, as to set aside the philosophy of these writers, as inconsistent with fact, and to remove for ever this stumbling-block of their philosophy away from the path of the inquiring believer. Great efforts, therefore, are made by these critics, and we believe in perfect sincerity, to explain how the writer of this prophecy

must have framed it rather with reference to past history than to future events, and how, in fact, he must have lived even in the time of the events which he foretells. The efforts of these writers, as we have seen, are fruitless as regards the prophecy of the great image. Nevertheless, the result arrived at in this instance is looked upon as one of the special triumphs of modern criticism; and it is now declared to be "clear beyond fair doubt that the period of 'weeks' ended with Antiochus Epiphanes."* In a recent publication,† Dr. Williams claims a candid hearing for a writer who has undertaken to place this view of the subject in a clear and intelligible light. We rejoice to see that the writer thus put forward, Mr. Desprez, is not only a scholar, but one who has given much thought to the subject, and that he has expressed himself clearly, temperately, and apparently with sincerity, in all that he has advanced.

Dr. Pusey has with much labour and fidelity examined the various expositions of the German section of these interpreters, and any one anxious to enter fully into their arguments will do well to consult his work. We propose to lay before the reader the results arrived at, rather than the reasonings of this class of critics. Their interpretations in fact resolve themselves into three very distinct prophetic enigmas, or cabalistic formulæ, by which seven times seventy, or 490 years, may by some mysterious pro-

* "Essays and Reviews," p. 69.

† Introduction to Philip S. Desprez's work on Daniel, p. xlii.

cess be comprehended within, either 429, or 441, or 424 years.

Mr. Desprez's work, however, which treats the subject in a popular manner for English readers, requires somewhat more examination. He has had the benefit of the ideas of those who have gone before him in this line of interpretation, and has embodied clearly and distinctly what appears to be most tenable in all that they have advanced. The words of Daniel we have seen present to us several very distinct ideas:—

1st. A command to restore and to build Jerusalem, from which certain weeks of years are to be computed.

2nd. The appearance of one anointed a prince.

3rd. The cutting off or death of this prince.

4th. The destruction of the city and sanctuary of Jerusalem.

5th. The ceasing of the sacrifice and oblation in the temple.

6th. The overspreading of abominations causing it to be made desolate.

7th. The anointing of "a holy of holies" at the end of certain weeks.

8th. The fulfilment of these various events at certain epochs in a then well-understood Sabbatical cycle.

Now the book of Maccabees records a remarkable persecution of the Jews in the days of Antiochus Epiphanes, whose reign lasted from B.C. 175 to 164, during which the daily sacrifice and the

oblation in the temple of Jerusalem was caused to cease, the altar profaned for exactly three years, and "the abomination of desolation" set up.* It informs us how Judas Maccabeus, an anointed prince, was slain in battle in the year B.C. 161; and how "Jerusalem lay void as a wilderness" — "the sanctuary also was trodden down, and aliens kept the stronghold: the heathen had their habitation in that place, and joy was taken from Jacob:"† and how again, at the end of three years, the sanctuary was cleansed from pollution, and the "holy of holies" re-anointed, or consecrated.

Here then are a series of remarkable events in Jewish history which strike Mr. Desprez, as they cannot fail to strike the mind of every candid reader acquainted with the Jewish prophets, as peculiarly applicable to the words of Dan. ix. 26, 27. So applicable, indeed, as to have induced some of the most eminent biblical critics of the present day to look upon them as the actual counterpart of Daniel's words. It is observed also by these critics that the eleventh or last chapter but one of the book, manifestly consists of a minute detail of historical events, written in prophetic style, from the days of Alexander down to the days of the Maccabees, and that the writer, after giving an account of the ceasing of the daily sacrifice at Jerusalem, the setting up in those days of "the abomination which maketh desolate," and the destruction of the king who had inflicted these evils on the Jews, there sud-

* 1 Macc. iii. 45.

† 1 Macc. i. 54.

denly drops all detail, and goes off into events which, after an interval of two thousand years, have certainly not even yet come to pass.

It is urged, with much critical justice, that this chapter is unlike the style of prophecy either in this or in any other book of Scripture, and that, from the extreme minuteness of the detail, the writer can only be supposed to have lived after, or about, the time of Judas Maccabeus, when the events foretold occurred. But if so, the inferences to be derived from this assumed fact would seem to be decisive of the character of the book. For, if the writer of this chapter was the writer of the whole book, then was the whole book merely an uninspired production of the days of the Maccabees. This, then, is the inference of Mr. Desprez and of the whole of this class of critics. The hero of Daniel's poem is declared to be King Antiochus Epiphanes, and the events of his reign are said to be found to run like a thread through the whole of this supposed prophetic book of Scripture.*

Nothing can be more plain and definite than this theory of interpretation, and it brings the question of the prophetic character, or otherwise, of the book of Daniel at once to issue. It involves, however, the necessity on the part of those who maintain it, to explain, at least with some degree of plausibility, how the several visions and narratives contained in the book can, in the mind of the writer, have been connected with the times and history of Antiochus

* Desprez, p. 162.

and the Maccabees. Mr. Desprez seems to feel perfectly satisfied and at ease as regards this point. The chief substance, indeed, of his work is an attempt to point out modes of application and resemblance between the several chapters of Daniel and the times of Antiochus, which certainly would not have occurred to the mind of an ordinary reader, and his view of the subject is thus illustrated. Speaking of the dream of Nebuchadnezzar, chap. ii., he observes: "It is thought that the dream of Nebuchadnezzar is only one phase of analogous visions, moulded into its present shape with a view of enabling the writer to append an historico-prophetic interpretation, accommodated to the circumstances of the Maccabean period."* With regard to the scene on the plain of Dura, chap. iii., he says: "The coincidence between the scenes we have depicted, and the circumstances of the holy people, (in the days of Antiochus) is too obvious to need comment. A second Nebuchadnezzar had arisen in the person of Antiochus, whose religious intolerance declared itself in the attempt to coerce all those with whom he came in contact, to worship the gods of his own adoration. The dedication of the golden image on the plain of Dura, corresponds to the dedication of the temple of Jupiter Olympius,† and the compulsory worship of the three children to similar religious coercion in the village of Modin.‡ The destruction of the men who execute the king's command reappears in the slaughter by Mat-

* P. 38.

† 2 Macc. vi. 2.

‡ 1 Macc. ii. 15.

tathias of the king's commissioners ; and the escape of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, from the fiery furnace, in that of Mattathias and his sons in the mountains. The faithfulness of the martyrs in the age of Daniel is reproduced in the steadfastness of those of the days of Antiochus ; and the reward of those who were 'promoted in the province of Babylon, exceeded by the promise of a better resurrection.'"^{*} The madness of Nebuchadnezzar, chap. iv., is assimilated to the mad acts of Epiphaues, which had caused him to be called Epimanes, or madman ; and is supposed to be brought forward by the writer with the view of drawing a parallel between the circumstances of the Babylonian and Syrian monarchs.[†] Again, the scene in the banqueting-hall of Belshazzar, chap. v., leading to the interpretation of the handwriting on the wall, is viewed by Mr. Desprez solely with reference to the impiety towards the God of heaven then exhibited by the Babylonian king, who is thus forced into comparison with Antiochus ; and Mr. Desprez feels himself justified in observing, that "from the comparison instituted between these leaders of impiety, it will be seen that their respective circumstances present a singular conformity with each other ; the type fitting so closely to its antitype, as to leave room for the impression that the writer drew an imaginary Belshazzar in Antiochus."[‡] The scene, of Daniel condemned by Darius to be devoured by lions, chap. vi., is touched upon with reference to the one single

^{*} P. 45.

[†] P. 54.

[‡] P. 67.

point of contact between Darius and Antiochus, viz. —their assumption to themselves of the honours of divinity. And the “little horn,” of chap. vii., which rises up amongst the *ten* kingdoms of the fourth empire; and the “little horn,” which stands up in the latter days on the platform of the *four* kingdoms of the third empire, chap. viii., are both identified with Antiochus, notwithstanding the dissimilarity of symbols. “The portion of the book,” adds Mr. Desprez, “which may be called the biography of Daniel, ends with this deliverance” (of Daniel from the lions), “the remaining part being chiefly occupied with an historico-prophetic narration of events, extending to the times of Antiochus Epiphanes. And it is only when viewed in the light in which we have attempted to present the subject, that the former part of the book can be regarded in unity with the latter. Apart from the consideration that the history is illustrative of the prophetic portion, no sufficient reason can be given for the intermixture of personal biography and prophetic vision in a work purporting to be written by the same individual. But when it is perceived that the scenes on the plain of Dura and at Babylon prefigure those elsewhere enacted; that the idolatrous deifications of the monarchs of Babylon and Media reflect impieties of a subsequent age; that the deliverances of the servants of God, who trusted in Him in old time, foreshadow the triumphs of those saints who should in later days possess the kingdom; the unity is restored; the

plan of the writer is seen to be consistent ; and the prophetic vision resolves itself into one grand whole of absorbing interest, having for its object the suffering and rescue of the holy people."*

We have thus endeavoured to give a fair sketch and outline of Mr. Desprez's critical exegesis of the book of Daniel ; which may also be taken as representing the views in general of the sceptical class of critics. And we ask of every candid and unprejudiced reader, can anything be more forced or fanciful than the whole series of comparisons, assumptions, and reasonings here set forth ? How much more simple is the view of those who treat each separate chapter in the light in which it is plainly and obviously presented to us by the writer. We absolutely deny that any one of these seven chapters, excepting the eighth, bears any appearance of having been written with an eye to events in the reign of Antiochus. The prophecy of the great image, as we have seen, reaches down to the time when "the God of heaven shall set up a kingdom never to be destroyed," a kingdom which "shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom," and reaches therefore far beyond the wretched times of persecution under Antiochus, when the kingdom of the holy people was nearly destroyed. The deliverance of the "three children" from the furnace, has no more resemblance to anything which occurred in the reign of that king, than to any instance of Jewish deliverance from per-

* P. 79.

secution which might be picked from the times of the Crusades, or of the Inquisition. The scene in the palace of Belshazzar obviously marks, and is intended to mark, the exact time of transition of the empire of the East, from the hands of the Babylonians to those of the Medes and Persians, even down to the minute particular of the age of the Persian king at the time of the overthrow of Babylon;* it is written with a view to the fulfilment of the predictions concerning the rise of the second or Medo-Persian empire, to the completion of the seventy years of servitude at Babylon, and to the exact date of the commencement of the Seventy Weeks.† It bears no similitude whatever (except in common acts of impiety) to the events of the reign of Antiochus, during whose reign no great dynastic change affecting the destinies of the holy people took place. The scene of Daniel and the lions' den, according to the chronological reckoning which we adopt, marks the struggle between the waning corruptions of the popular worship of Persia in the days of Darius Hystaspes, and the then revival of ancient monotheism in that empire,—a struggle leading to the establishment of Daniel in one of the highest positions of the state, to the proclamation of Darius, “that in every dominion of my kingdom men tremble and fear before the God of Daniel,”‡ and to the all-important decree of Darius, which naturally resulted from this proclamation, under which the temple of Jerusalem was builded and finished in the sixth year of that

* Dan. v. 31.

† Zech. ii. 7.

‡ Dan. vi. 26.

same king's reign, as then styled king of Assyria,* when provision was also made of bullocks, rams, and lambs, "that they may offer sacrifices of sweet savours unto the God of heaven, and pray for the life of the king and his sons."† We have already expressed our conviction that the prophecy of the "little horn" of chap. vii. which leads down to the time when "one like a son of man shall come with the clouds of heaven and come to the Ancient of Days," has reference to events yet fulfilling, and to be fulfilled, on the holy people chiefly in the West: and that the prophecy of the "little horn" of chapter viii., which leads down to the times of "the last end of the indignation" has reference to events yet fulfilling and to be fulfilled on the holy people in the East, and that they can have no possible connexion therefore with the days of the Syro-Grecian king. We feel satisfied that no unprejudiced reader of Daniel will be able to bring himself to see what Mr. Desprez has persuaded himself that he sees in these historical parallels; and we question whether he has not in these forced similitudes made himself amenable to the terms of reproof contained in the following words of his own quotation: "To suppose that we can serve God's cause by shutting our eyes to the light; much more to suppose that we can serve it by asserting that we see what we do not see, *because we wish to see it*, is simply intellectual atheism."‡ Lest, however, we ourselves should also be found subject to the

* Ezra, vi. 22. † Ezra, vi. 9, 10, 14. ‡ P. 4.

words of this pointed admonition, let us be careful, while differing thus from Mr. Desprez's mode of interpretation, neither to close our eyes to facts, nor to be found slurring over or keeping out of sight any one observation which may appear to be adverse to our conviction of the inspired character of the book.

How is it, it is asked, that the book of Daniel is so profuse and detailed in its description of the times of the Greek empire in Syria, and of those times only, and that the composition of the book, while dwelling on those times, is found to be in the most prosaic style of human annals? * How is it that this minute description of events stops suddenly short in Maccabean days? And how is it that the whole remainder of the prophetic portion of the book is so magnificently grand in outline, while foreshadowing the rise and fall of mighty empires and kingdoms, not of petty kings, and so altogether at variance with the prosaic style of this one chapter?

We see no reason to be unthankful to modern critics for having drawn attention to these remark-

* The historical detail of chap. xi. descends even down to such minutiae as these: "The king's daughter of the south shall come to the king of the north to make an agreement: but she shall not retain the power of the arm; neither shall he stand, nor his arm: but she shall be given up, and they that brought her, and he that begat her, and he that strengthened her in these times." (Ch. xi. 6.) And again, "Both these kings' hearts shall be to do mischief, and they shall speak lies at one table," &c. &c. (Chap. xi. 27.) Contrast these expressions with the sublime imagery of the prophetic text, x. 5, 6, and xii. 7.

able phenomena in the book of Daniel. They have opened a subject for inquiry which demands and is entitled to searching and dispassionate investigation, and one which we trust in due time will receive its proper explanation. Meanwhile, however, we cannot agree with them that the hasty solution which they have given is either the true one, or one that necessarily flows even from the facts which they have pointed out. It yet remains a question, even for their own consideration, whether the author of chapter xi. was the author of the whole book.

If critics in these days are struck with the resemblance of events during the Maccabean struggle to the events foretold by Daniel, chapter ix. 26, 27, how much more powerfully must the minds of those who lived in the days of that struggle, and when these remarkable events were coming to pass, have been affected in the same direction : when nothing of a similar nature had yet occurred in their history, since their return from captivity, which could in any way be supposed to be applicable to Daniel's words, and yet when all around them seemed then to be fulfilling almost exactly as he had foretold. We know how prone we are in these our own days, and many similar instances in history might be pointed out, to press the words of prophecy, and even to pervert the words of prophecy, into conformity with the events of our own times, and such as seem likely soon to come to pass : to concentrate all that is spoken of as future, if possible, within our present age. We cannot, therefore, doubt that pious

Jews, intensely moved by the apparent correspondence between the troubles and calamities depicted by Daniel and the calamities which were coming upon them daily in the reign of Antiochus, were in the habit of pointing out to each other how the prophecy was to all appearance then being accomplished in the events. Turning their minds intently upon the mysterious yet hopeful words of Daniel, till then but little heeded, and comparing them with Jewish history, they saw clearly,—

1st. How the decree of Cyrus, king of Persia, for the rebuilding of the temple, by which Jerusalem had become a second time the “holy city,” had been accomplished in agreement with the words of that book.

2nd. How this heathen Prince Cyrus had been specially designated by the Lord Himself as “His Messiah,” or His anointed, that is, as one selected for this particular purpose of restoring the “holy city.” How Zerubbabel, together with the high-priest Jeshua, had been spoken of as one of the two “sons of oil,” or anointed ones, “that stand by the Lord of the whole earth;”^{*} that is, as one probably selected to fulfil the events predicted at the end of seven weeks : and how their own Judas Maccabeus, now fighting in honour of that temple, might also properly be looked upon as the Messiah, or anointed one, foretold, by whom the supremacy of Israel might yet have to be established.

3rd. They saw how this anointed prince had,

^{*} Zech. iv. 14.

nevertheless, been cut off in battle, while striving to deliver the "holy people," in B.C. 161.

4th. They saw how "the city and the sanctuary" had been laid desolate and trodden down for three full years, or for nearly "half a week."

5th. How the daily "sacrifice and oblation" in the temple had ceased during the term of desecration, and the abomination of desolation had been set up.

6th. And how the sanctuary had again been cleansed, and "the holy of holies" anointed by the valiant Judas, their anointed prince, towards the close of a Sabbatical week, in B.C. 165.

Who could fail in Maccabean days, notwithstanding many obvious difficulties in the application, to couple these events with Daniel's words? We have sufficient evidence before us of the fact, that they were then so applied. And yet, nevertheless, we confidently dispute their applicability as urged by critics of the present day.

Dr. Pusey has already drawn attention to the fact, that the Septuagint translator of Daniel, who, it may be assumed, lived some time after the days of the Maccabees, and whose Greek version was for a long time the received version of the Church, has endeavoured so to paraphrase or pervert the words of Daniel, ix. 24, 25, as to apply them to the days of Antiochus. Dr. Pusey writes :—"In the prophecy of the seventy weeks the translator repeatedly falsifies the time, in order to make it fit in with that of Epiphanes. For the dates of the original he twice

substitutes 'seven, and seventy, and sixty-two,'* making 139. This, according to the era of the Seleucidæ, which the Jews used, comprised the second year of the reign of Epiphanes" (B.C. 174 = E.S. 139), soon after whose accession Onias was deposed, to which act this writer probably alluded in his unfaithful paraphrase, 'chrism shall be removed.'† This translator also paraphrases the coming of "the ships of Chittim" (xi. 30), as the interference of the Romans, which we read took place in the reign of Antiochus, in favour of the Jews. "And the Romans shall come and expel him, and rebuke him angrily."

Josephus also, we know, professedly, though erroneously in our opinion, interpreted what is related concerning the little horn of the vision of the ram and the goat of chapter viii. as applicable to An-

* This reading is adopted as the true one by Dr. Blaney, Archbishop Magee, Mr. Galloway, and others. They reckon seven-and-seventy weeks as equal to 539 years, reaching from the first of Cyrus, B.C. 538, to the birth of Christ. We would suggest that the translator may perhaps have interpreted the words, "Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people and upon the city of Sion" (ix. 24) as accomplished on the completion of the seventy sabbaths kept during the desolation of Jerusalem, which seventy sabbaths added to 420 years, during which the first temple had stood, would make up 490 years. But that the seven-and-seventy and sixty-two, or 973 years (v. 25), were reckoned by the translator from the building of Jerusalem in the days of David or Solomon, and ended with the extinction of the Asmoneans, in the reign of Herod, so fixing the date of the translation to that reign.

† Pusey on Daniel, p. 379.

tiochus Epiphanes. For after identifying the he-goat with Alexander, the first king of Greece, who conquered the Persians, and the four kingdoms which followed him, as the kingdoms of his successors, he goes on to say how Daniel foretold that "from among them there should arise a certain king who should overcome our nation and their laws, and should take away their political government, and should spoil the temple, and forbid the sacrifices to be offered for three years time : and indeed it so came to pass that our nation suffered these things under Antiochus Epiphanes according to Daniel's vision." *

Again, the sober and accurate writer of the first book of Maccabees, who wrote some fifty or sixty years after the death of Antiochus, clearly had in his mind the application of chapters viii. and ix. of Daniel, to that king, when he began his history by describing how Alexander smote Darius, the king of the Persians and Medes, that is, how the he-goat "smote the ram and brake his *two* horns ;" how his servants after his death put crowns upon their heads, and their sons after them, and how "*there came out of them a wicked root*, Antiochus Epiphanes, son of Antiochus the king," who "entered proudly into the sanctuary," who wrote letters to "forbid burnt-offerings and sacrifice, and drink-

* Ant. x. xi. 7. It may be observed, that Josephus, while drawing attention to the accuracy of the prophecies of Daniel, makes no allusion to that most remarkably minute and accurate of all his prophecies, viz. ch. xi. which bears so distinctly upon Antiochus.

offerings in the temple," and "set up the abomination of desolation upon the altar, and builded idol altars throughout the cities of Judah on every side." *

Another striking evidence of the tendency of the Jews in the days of Antiochus, to apply the prophecies of Daniel to their own times is found in the third Sibylline book, in which the "ten horns" of the fourth kingdom of Dan. ch. vii. are clearly referred to as representing some supposed tenfold division of the empire of Alexander, and the "little horn" of that vision represented by a "horn" (*κέρας*), which rises up from amongst the ten (*ἐκ δέκα δὴ κεράτων*). The writer thus using the very expressions of the prophet. "The third Sibylline book," writes Dr. Pusey, "is now generally held to be the work of a Jew in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes. It threatens unhesitatingly that all the evils which had been done by the Romans in Asia should be requited with usury upon them"—"The writer three times fixes his date by annexing the prophecies of the conversion of the heathen to the date of the seventh king who should rule over Egypt"—"The date then of the writer cannot be later than about B.C. 170."† This Sibylline book affords strong evidence, therefore, as Dr. Pusey observes, of this portion of the book of Daniel having been in existence before that date. But the

* 1 Macc. i. 9, 10, 45, 54. If the writers of the two books of Maccabees had received ch. xi. as prophecy, they could hardly fail to have made some reference to it as having been accurately fulfilled by Antiochus. They probably, therefore, knew it to be merely comment.

† Pusey's "Daniel," pp. 160, 364.

inference which we draw from the fact of the repeated application in those days, of the prophecies of Daniel to the times of Antiochus, is, that the reign of that king represents one of those deeply disturbed and exciting periods in the history of God's people in which men's hearts were troubled, and found "failing them for fear, and for looking after those things which are coming on the earth," and when the tendency was to force all prophecy, if possible, whether truly applicable or not, to bear upon the events which so powerfully agitated their minds.

A feverish impression then pervaded the nation, that their lot had fallen in the time of "the latter days;" that the "time of trouble, such as never was since there was a nation, even to that same time," foretold by Daniel, had at length come upon them; that the day of resurrection was at hand—the day when the holy "people shall be delivered, every one that shall be found written in the book"—that is, as then interpreted, "written in the Scripture of truth." The imagination of the multitude began to people the atmosphere around them with supernatural beings, their old men dreamed dreams, and their young men saw visions. "Then it happened that through all the city, for the space almost of forty days, there were seen horsemen running in the air in cloth of gold, and armed with lances like a band of soldiers, and troops of horsemen in array, encountering and running one against another with shaking of shields, &c. &c."* The contest between

* 2 Macc. v. 2, 3.

Pharisees and Sadducees ran high in those days. The freethinking Sadducees, who say "there is no resurrection, neither angel, nor spirit," and who were carried away by the influence of the intelligent but unbelieving Greeks, with whom they associated, no doubt rejected all such spiritual ideas; but the Pharisees, who were then the ruling party, and looked up to by the multitude, dwelt much upon the doctrine and promise of the resurrection, and were inclined at the same time to add to their belief both doubtful traditions and superstitions, especially as regarded the superintending agency of angels and spirits in the affairs of this world. The book of Daniel was especially a stronghold of these Pharisaic opinions. The strange doctrine of the distribution of the kingdoms of the earth, "according to the number of the angels of God,"* and of the appointment by God of special guardian angels to watch over the affairs of each separate kingdom, supposed to be contained in this book, emanated as we shall see from the Pharisees of these times; while a morbid inclination seems to have grown up amongst them of seeking after signs, and of listening with ready ears to the dreams and revelations of pretended prophets. Judas Maccabeus piously waited in expectation of the coming of a prophet,† and on one occasion encouraged his followers by the recital of a dream, in which the prophet Jeremiah appeared to present him with a golden sword.‡

* Deut. xxxii. 8, Septuagint translation.

† 1 Macc. iv. 46.

‡ 2 Macc. xv. 12-16.

While John Hyrcanus, the high-priest, who was a Pharisee, is especially mentioned as claiming to himself the gift of prophecy. We may judge of the superstitious and secular character of his pretended revelations, from two instances mentioned by Josephus, one in which being alone in the temple, offering incense, a voice proclaimed to him that his sons who were fighting with Antiochus Cyzicenus had conquered their enemy;* another in which "he foresaw and foretold that his two eldest sons would not continue masters of the government" after his death.† Judas also, of the sect of the Essenes, living in those days, is said to have exhibited his powers of prophecy in many instances of a similar secular character.

Such, then, being the excited and superstitious temper of the times under the reign of the Maccabean rulers, it is not unreasonable to assume that there were not only many other instances besides those to which we have referred, of attempted application of the words of Daniel vii. viii. and ix. to those troublous days, but that even words of pretended prophecy may not have been too readily rejected by those who were then recollecting the sacred books which had been burnt, and destroyed by order of Antiochus, and nearly lost during the war.‡

With the deepest reverence and admiration, therefore, for the contents of this most wondrous and holy book, and humbly trusting in the guidance of the

* Jos. Ant. xiii. 3.

† Bell. Jud. i. 2, 8.

‡ 2 Macc. ii. 14.

Spirit which dictated it, we venture to submit, that the portion of Daniel which has given so much offence to seriously minded critics, and which bears about it the appearance of so comparatively low and human a style of composition, is, in fact, merely one of these many forced attempts at application of prophecy to the days of the Maccabees. We agree with Arnold that "there can be no spiritual meaning made out of the kings of the north and south,"* and the passages, therefore, containing those histories cannot be reckoned as the words of Daniel. They are obviously made up of pure history; and though written indeed in the form of prophecy, as was the style and manner of the day, with a view probably to increased dignity, yet in their original form, as we shall endeavour to show, they had no pretension to be considered words of prophecy at all. We believe them to represent merely an ingenious instance of illustrative paraphrase, written by the hand of some zealous Pharisee† of Jerusalem, soon after the days of Antiochus, and that they were inserted marginally, with the intention of concentrating on Antiochus and his days prophecies which were never intended to apply to him, but which by means of this one interpolation are clearly made so to bear: that they were appended with the idea of illustrating, first the prophecy of ch. vii. as regards the ten horns, out of which a little horn, falsely assume to be Antiochus Epiphanes, should arise, and of

* Life of Arnold, vol. ii. p. 195.

† The contests of angels in ch. x. is clearly Pharisaic.

connecting that chapter with ch. viii. which refers to another little horn to arise, "when the transgressors are come to the full," falsely interpreted to be Antiochus the Great ; secondly, of applying the words of ch. ix. as regards the setting up of the abomination of desolation at Jerusalem, and the ceasing of the daily sacrifice, to the reign of Epiphanes ; and, lastly, of coupling these three chapters with chap. xii. and the times of the resurrection, which were then probably supposed to be close at hand.*

It would be difficult, as we have said, to believe there were not many such comments in existence in the days of the Maccabees : and less difficult, we think, to believe that this condensed history of the Greeks in Syria down to that time, written thus in prophetic style, and displaying much historical accuracy on the part of the writer, may have been inserted marginally, that is, to say, in the alternate columns of the roll of the book of some pious and esteemed authority of those days, even of John Hyrcanus himself, and so, in deference to that authority in after time, and also to the unquestioned value of the comment, or even with the view of shutting out later and more true interpretation of chap. ix., may at length have been suffered by the Scribes of the day to stand annexed to the text of the authorised copies of the book itself. In this view we may also call to remembrance the extreme license taken by pious Jews about that time, in assuming

* 2 Macc. vii. 6, 9, 11, 14, 23, 29, 36.

the prophetic style in their compositions, and even the names of holy men who had gone before them, as instanced in the prophecies of the Second Book of Esdras, and in the book of Enoch, and especially in the well-known apocryphal additions to this very book of Daniel. The principal interpolation lies between chap. x. 14, and chap. xi. ver. 35, exclusive of a genuine passage, xi. 2, 3, 4, and professes to be an explanation of "that which is noted in the Scripture of Truth," that is to say, noted in "the book" or writing then lying before the interpreter, concerning "the truth," a comment founded upon which must not be mistaken for prophecy. We think that the marks of paraphrase may clearly be discovered both at the beginning, middle, and end of the passage: and it may also be observed that when this passage is read parenthetically as comment, the sublime and lofty character of Daniel's composition, which seems to be disturbed by its insertion, is preserved throughout the book without a break.

It had not been our intention to have touched again upon this portion of the book of Daniel, as not lying strictly within our province, and we would gladly have avoided doing so. The whole of Mr. Desprez's arrangement, however, seems interwoven with this one doubtful chapter: and while reading it again with a view to his observations, the words of Dr. Arnold have come back upon us so forcibly, and have seemed to suggest the means of so efficient an explanation of his difficulties, that we can-

not refrain from offering the above suggestion for consideration, even at the risk of offending some whose judgment we respect. Dr. Arnold writes, "I have long thought that (the greater?) part of Daniel is most certainly a very late work of the times of the Maccabees, and the pretended prophecy about the kings of Greece and Persia, and the north and south, mere history. In fact, you can trace distinctly the date when it was written, because the events up to that date are given with historical minuteness, totally unlike the character of real prophecy."* Now let any one compare the words of Daniel, ix. 27. "He shall confirm the covenant with many,"—"He shall cause the sacrifice and oblation to cease,"—"and for the overspreading of abominations he shall make it desolate,"—"until the consummation,"—"and that determined shall be poured out;"—with ch. xi. 30-36, according to the present arrangement of that chapter:† "He," Antiochus "shall have indignation against the covenant,"—"shall take away the daily sacrifice,"—"shall place the abomination which maketh desolate,"—"shall prosper till the indignation be accomplished,"—"for that determined shall be done;"—and say whether

* Life of Arnold, vol. ii. p. 95.

† We submit that the present arrangement of chap. xi. was not accepted, either by the writers of the two books of Maccabees or by Josephus, who both consulted and understood the Hebrew arrangement. This final arrangement, resulting from the miscopying of the Hebrew manuscripts containing the comment, may, however, have been received by those who followed the Greek version before Josephus wrote.

it is possible to conceive that this repetition of the same phrases is the result of mere coincidence, or whether these latter words are not put together with reference in some way to the former. But if so, since the latter words unquestionably refer to the times of Antiochus, and all believers in prophecy are satisfied that the former apply with equal certainty to the times of Titus, the conclusion is thus pressed upon us that the latter words are probably words of application, and therefore of interpolation. Again, the connexion between the following passages is, if possible, still more striking. Compare ch. xi. 36. "The king shall do according to his will;" v. 41, "He shall enter also into the glorious land;" v. 45, "He shall come to his end, and none shall help him;" with the words of ch. xi. 16, 19, "He that cometh against him," Antiochus the Great, "shall do according to his own will;" "He shall stand in the glorious land;" "He shall stumble and fall, and not be found." Arnold, we think, has done service to the cause of truth in boldly speaking out, and thus leading to inquiry. Let no one, however, suppose that our suggestion tends in any way to countenance the idea, that the prophecies of Daniel, in general, could possibly have been composed in the time of the Maccabees. On the contrary, when part of this one questionable chapter is separated from the text, as representing mere interpolated comment, the theory which would apply the tenor of the whole book to Antiochus necessarily falls to the ground, since the main argument, if not the

only plausible argument, in support of such application is founded on this one single chapter. The hero of the supposed prophetic poem, on removal of a portion of chapter xi., entirely disappears: each chapter of the book which has been forced into connexion with his history then remains to be explained in the spirit of its own plain contents: while the fact of an appended comment affords an indisputable argument that the text itself was *not* then composed, and that veneration was attached to the text at the time the comment was made.


But if this be the true view of the question, and we do not fear that it can be entirely set aside, then would it appear that the persecutions of Antiochus have been nowhere made the subject of prophecy throughout the book of Daniel, and that, so far from its being "clear beyond all doubt," as Dr. Williams assures us, "that the period of weeks ended in the reign of Antiochus," the only foundation for that ill-supported idea would seem to be traced to the delusions of those troubled days. And yet we have before remarked, that it would seem hard to be believed that the prophet should thus have overlooked in vision those days of persecution. The answer to the difficulty, however, seems to be, that chap. ix. certainly does pass over and does take no notice of the troubles in that reign; that chap. vii., viii., and xii., all seem to apply to times reaching far beyond the events even of chap. ix., and that the events predicted in the genuine fragments of chap. x. and xi., together with ch. xii., professedly apply

to "the latter days," and not, therefore, to the comparatively early days of Antiochus.

Another inference to be drawn from our suggestion is, that if parts of chap. xi. consist of comment on other parts of this and earlier chapters of the book of Daniel, the writer of that comment was probably the compiler and editor of the whole book, and that the time of its admission therefore, not into the Canon of Prophets, but into the section of Ketubim or Hagiographa, was not earlier than the days of the Maccabees, as first pointed out by sceptical critics. The several genuine writings of Daniel, though already well known at Jerusalem, may now have been selected from amongst other spurious writings attributed to the prophet, and put together in consecutive form as one book, the text collated and fixed, and some other slight additions in the way of comment, such as chap. i. 21, "And Daniel continued unto the first year of Cyrus," and vi. 28, "So this Daniel prospered in the reign of Darius—and in the reign of Cyrus," and possibly some few other passages, may have been then appended by the compiler.

Thus the authorised copies of the book of Daniel in the subsequent days of Hillel and Shammai, like our authorised copies of the Bible in present days, with their comments, may have been arranged, as suggested, in alternate columns, in connexion with this supposed valuable historical interpretation, and yet in a manner not to be misunderstood by the learned Rabbis of those ante-Christian days, who

ROLL OF THE BOOK OF DANIEL.



CONSECUTIVE PASSAGES OF TEXT AND COMMENT IN THE BOOK OF DANIEL.

Text.	Comment.	Text.	Comment.
ChXlv.36 to ChXlv.13.	ChXlv.5 to ChXlv.35	ChXlv.2 to ChXlv.4	ChX.v.15. to ChXlv.1.
		ChX.v.2 to ChX.v.14	ChX.v.1

had the key to the arrangement in their minds; and in the same manner may the authorised manuscripts have continued for ages to have been transcribed, and so faithfully have been transmitted to posterity. And yet, nevertheless, they may at length have been misunderstood by Rabbis of a darker age, and so both text and comment have become merged together in one continuous text. As regards the LXX. translator, who was probably some Greek proselyte better versed in his own language than in the traditions of the Scribes, nothing can be more natural than that he should have copied both text and comment consecutively, and that those, therefore, who were only acquainted with the Scriptures in the Greek version, should through that version have accepted without question the whole as the words of Daniel. Nor, in such a case, would any later translator, such as Theodotion, be more open to the charge of carelessness, than our own eminent critics of the present day, for not having detected and expunged the innocent interpolation, considering that, on reference to Hebrew manuscripts, both Greek and Hebrew apparently agreed.

DANIEL'S PROPHECY OF THE LATTER DAYS.

N.B. The reader is requested to read consecutively, pp. 110, 112, 114, 116, 118, and 120, and then the paraphrase.

CHAPTER X.

2 In those days* I Daniel was mourning three full weeks.

3 I ate no pleasant bread, neither came flesh nor wine in my mouth, neither did I anoint myself at all, till three whole weeks were fulfilled.

4 And in the four and twentieth day of the first month, as I was by the side of the great river, which is Hiddekel ;

5 Then I lifted up mine eyes, and looked, and behold a certain man clothed in linen, whose loins were girded with fine gold of Uphaz :

6 His body also was like the beryl, and his face as the appearance of lightning, and his eyes as lamps of fire, and his arms and his feet like in colour to polished brass, and the voice of his words like the voice of a multitude.

7 And I Daniel alone saw the vision : for the men that were with me saw not the vision ; but a great quaking fell upon them, so that they fled to hide themselves.

8 Therefore I was left alone, and saw this great vision, and there remained no strength in me : for my comeliness was turned in me into corruption, and I retained no strength.

9 Yet heard I the voice of his words : and when I heard the voice of his words, then was I in a deep sleep on my face, and my face toward the ground.

10 And, behold, an hand touched me, which set me upon my knees and upon the palms of my hands.

11 And he said unto me, O Daniel, a man greatly beloved, understand the words that I speak unto thee, and stand upright : for unto thee am I now sent. And when he had spoken this word unto me, I stood trembling.

* "In those days,"—that is, in the reign of Darius son of Hystaspes, see chap. ix. 1, in the first, or possibly the third year of his reign over the Chaldeans, in the year B.C. 490 or 493, not, as explained in the marginal comment, "in the third year of Cyrus king of Persia."

RABBINICAL PARAPHRASE OF THE SCRIPTURE OF TRUTH.

MARGINAL COMMENT.

Text, Ch. x. 2. In those days, &c., that is,

Comment. Ch. x. 1. *In the third year of Cyrus (qu. Darius?*) king of Persia a thing was revealed unto Daniel, whose name was called Belteshazzar; and the thing was true, but the time appointed was long: and he understood the thing, and had understanding of the vision.*

Text, Ch. x. 9. And when I heard the voice of his words, then was I in a deep sleep, and my face toward the ground.

Comment, Ch. x. 15. *And when he had spoken such words unto me, I set my face toward the ground, and I became dumb.†*

Text, Ch. x. 8. My comeliness was turned in me into corruption, and I retained no strength.‡

Comment, Ch. x. 16. *And, behold, one like the similitude of the sons of men§ touched my lips: then I opened my mouth, and spake, and said unto him that stood before me, O my lord, by the vision my sorrows are turned upon me, and I have retained no strength.*

17 *For how can the servant of this my lord talk with this my lord? for as for me, straightway there remained no strength in me, neither is there breath in me.†*

Text, Ch. x. 10. And behold an hand touched me, &c.

Comment, Ch. x. 18. *Then there came again and touched me one like the appearance of a man, and he strengthened me.*

* The LXX. and Theodotion both read Cyrus, instead of Darius, in chap. xi. 1, in order to produce consistency between chap. x. and xi. But the alteration here of Cyrus into Darius would be preferable, as restoring chronological order throughout the genuine text of the book. The visions thus in the Chaldee would fall in the reigns of Nebuchadnezzar, Belshazzar, Darius son of Hystaspes. No vision in the reign of Cyrus. And in the Hebrew, in the reigns of Belshazzar and Darius.

† "And I became dumb," "neither is there breath in me." The interpreter seems to prefer the idea of speechlessness to sleep, as more agreeable to a waking vision.

‡ "I retained no strength." Verses 16, 17, 18, and 19, all comment on the renewal of the prophet's strength.

§ "One like the similitude of the sons of men," referring to chap. viii. 15.

112 DANIEL'S PROPHECY OF THE LATTER DAYS.

Ch. x. 12. Then said he unto me, Fear not, Daniel : for from the first day that thou didst set thine heart to understand, and chasten thyself before thy God, thy words were heard, and I am come for thy words.

13 (For the prince of the kingdom of Persia* withstood me [Daniel] one and twenty days : but, lo, Michael, one of the chief princes, came to help me ; and I remained there with the kings of Persia.)

14 Now I am come to make thee understand what shall befall thy people in the latter days : for yet the vision is for many days.

CHAP. XI. 2. And now I will shew thee the truth. Behold, there shall stand up yet three kings in Persia ;* and the fourth shall be far richer than they all :* and by his strength through his riches he shall stir up all against the realm of Grecia.

3 And a mighty king shall stand up, that shall rule with great dominion, and do according to his will.

4 And when he shall stand up, his kingdom shall be broken, and shall be divided toward the four winds of heaven ; and not to his posterity, nor according to his dominion which he ruled : for his kingdom shall be plucked up, and even for others beside those.

[*The prophecy continued p. 116.*]

The prophet having announced in chap. x. 14, that he is come to speak of events which shall happen to the Jews in "*the latter days*," and that the vision shall yet be "*for many days*," begins in the three next verses by amplifying chap. viii. 20, 21, 22, concerning the kingdoms of Persia and Greece, and thus leads back the mind of the reader to the words of chap. viii. 17, "*At the time of the end shall be the vision*," that is, the vision of the "*king of fierce countenance*," viii. 23, who shall appear at "*the last end of the indignation*," viii.

* This vision was seen in the first, or third year of Darius, when he was about sixty-two or sixty-four years of age (B.C. 493 or 490), and the book of Ezra certifies that Artach-Shashtha, or Xerxes, had then already been raised to the throne. (Ezra, iv. 7 ; vi. 14.) The four kings, therefore, who reigned in Persia, after Xerxes, were Artaxerxes Longimanus, Darius Nothus, Artaxerxes Mnemon, and Ochus. The fifth was dethroned by the "*mighty king*," Alexander. "*The prince of the kingdom of Persia*," was Xerxes, "*the kings of Persia*," Darius and Xerxes united, Michael one of the Jewish princes, otherwise written Mishael.

Text, Ch. x. 11. And he said unto me, O Daniel, a man greatly beloved.

Comment. Ch. x. 19. *And said, O man greatly beloved, fear not: peace be unto thee, be strong, yea, be strong. And when he had spoken unto me, I was strengthened, and said, Let my lord speak; for thou hast strengthened me.*

Text, Ch. x. 11. Then said he unto me, &c., Unto thee I am Now sent.

Comment. Ch. x. 20. *Then said he, Knowest thou wherefore I come unto thee?*

Text, Ch. x. 13. The prince of the kingdom of Persia withstood me one and twenty days.

Comment. Ch. x. 20. *And Now will I return to fight* with the prince of Persia: and when I am gone forth, lo, the prince of Grecia shall come.*

Text, Ch. x. 14. Now I am come to make thee understand what shall befall thy people in the latter days. Chap. xi. 2. And now will I show you the truth.

Comment. Ch. x. 21. *But I will show thee that which is noted in THE SCRIPTURE OF TRUTH:†*

Text, Ch. x. 13. Lo, Michael, one of the chief princes,‡ came to help me, &c.

Comment. Ch. x. 21. *And there is none that holdeth with me in these things, but Michael your prince.*

Text, Ch. x. 12. From the first day thou didst set thy heart to understand.

Comment. Ch. xi. 1. *Also I in the first year of Darius§ the Mede,|| even I, stood to confirm and strengthen him (i.e. Daniel).*

* "Fight with the prince of Persia." The doctrine that angels fight for the kingdoms committed to their charge, is here first introduced into the Bible.

† That is to say, what is written in chap. vii. 16 and 19, in answer to the words "I asked him the truth," "Then I would know the truth." Also in chap. viii. where in v. 26 it is declared that "the vision of the evening and the morning which was told is true." In other words, "I will show thee what is noted," in chap. vii., chap. viii., chap. ix., and chap. xii.

‡ Michael (one who is like unto God), the same as Mishael (who is that which God is), one of the Jewish princes, the difference of spelling being that between Hebrew and Chaldee. The interpreter makes him to be an angel.

§ Compare Daniel ix. 1, 23. As now in the third year of Cyrus, so "also I in the first year of Darius," stood to strengthen Daniel.

|| "Darius the Mede," truly, Darius, son of Hystaspes. The Medes and Persians still spoken of as Medes. See 2 Esdras, i. 3. The interpreter, however, supposed this king to have reigned before Cyrus, as a Median king.

19, and who shall stand up *in the latter time* of those kingdoms, which were to be formed on the platform of Alexander's empire in the East, that is, in "the latter days." And in conformity with this preamble, he goes on to speak of the time, when "many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake," xii. 1, and when, after "he shall have accomplished to scatter the power of the holy people, all these things shall be finished." xii. 7. We thus are led to collect that the scope of the prophecy of "the latter days," "reaches beyond a period of more than 2300 years, counted from the time of the vision, even beyond the present time, and that the events of "the latter days," according to our present knowledge, must therefore be looked for towards the latter half of this long period, beginning at least a thousand years or more after the date of the vision. Nothing, therefore, can be more fit than the apparently abrupt transition in the genuine text, from chap. xi. 4, to the words in chap. xi. 36. "The king shall do according to his will," that is to say, "the king of fierce countenance," representing, as we have said, the great apostasy of the latter days in the East, by which the holy people has been since the year A.D. 627, trodden under foot, and by which "the daily worship has been taken away, and the place of his sanctuary cast down," viii. 11. According to the terms, however, of the Rabbinical paraphrase, the chief subject of the prophecy is made to refer, not to the latter part of the period of 2300 years, but to the three first centuries of that period, which is quite inconsistent with the preamble.

ILLUSTRATION OF CHAPTER VII.

CONCERNING THE TEN HORNS OF THE FOURTH EMPIRE,
AND THE LITTLE HORN.

Text, xi. 4. For his kingdom shall be plucked up, and even for others beside those,*

Comment. Ch. xi. 5. *And the king of the south* [PTOLEMY PHILADELPHUS] ^{1st horn.} *shall be strong, and one of his princes* [ANTIOCHUS THEOS] ^{2nd horn.} *shall be strong above him, and have dominion: and his dominion shall be a great dominion.* ^{B.C. 285.}

6 *And in the end of years they shall join themselves together; for the king's daughter of the south* [BERENICE†] *shall come to the king of the north to make an agreement: but she shall not retain the power of the arm; neither shall he stand, nor his arm: but she shall be given up, and they that brought her,‡ and he that begat her, and he that strengthened her in these times.*

7 *But out of a branch of her roots shall one* [PTOLEMY EUERGETES] ^{3rd horn.} *stand up in his estate, which shall come with an army, and shall enter into the fortress of the king of the north* [SELEUCUS CALLINICUS], ^{B.C. 247.} *and shall deal against them, and shall prevail.* ^{4th horn.} ^{B.C. 245.}

8 *And shall also carry captives into Egypt their gods, with their princes, and with their precious vessels of silver and of gold: and he shall continue more years than the king of the north.*

9 *So the king of the south shall come into his kingdom, and shall return into his own land.*

10 *But his sons* [SELEUCUS CERAUNUS and ANTIOCHUS THE GREAT] *shall be stirred up, and shall assemble a multitude of great forces: and one* [ANTIOCHUS] ^{5th horn.} *shall certainly come, and overflow, and pass through: then shall he return, and be stirred up, even to his fortress.* ^{B.C. 223.}

11 *And the king of the south* [PTOLEMY PHILOPATOR] ^{6th horn.}

* That is, for the succession of ten kings, or horns, which follow. The prophet gives no particulars concerning the four successors of Alexander, but proceeds at once to the object of the vision, the king of the *latter days*. The interpreter, passing over Ptolemy Soter, Lysimachus, Cassander, and Seleucus Nicator, selects, out of more than twenty, *ten kings*, beginning with Philadelphus, and ending with Antiochus, and Philometer, who all lived nearly in his own days.

† Berenice, daughter of Ptolemy Philadelphus.

‡ Callinicus.

[*The prophecy continued from p. 112.*]

Ch. xi. 36 And the king shall do according to his will;* and he shall exalt himself, and magnify himself above every god, and shall speak marvellous things against the God of gods, and shall prosper till the indignation† be accomplished: for that that is determined shall be done.

37 Neither shall he regard the God of his fathers, nor the desire of women, nor regard any god: for he shall magnify himself above all.

38 But in his estate shall he honour the God of forces: and a god whom his fathers knew not shall he honour with gold, and silver, and with precious stones, and pleasant things.

39 Thus shall he do in the most strong holds with a strange god, whom he shall acknowledge and increase with glory: and he shall cause them to rule over many, and shall divide the land for gain.

40 And at the time of the end shall the king of the south push at him: and the king of the north shall come against him like a whirlwind, with chariots, and with horsemen, and with many ships; and he shall enter into the countries, and shall overflow and pass over.

41 He shall enter also into the glorious land, and many countries shall be overthrown: but these shall escape out of his hand, even Edom, and Moab, and the chief of the children of Ammon.

42 He shall stretch forth his hand also upon the countries: and the land of Egypt shall not escape.

43 But he shall have power over the treasures of gold and of silver, and over all the precious things of Egypt: and the Lybians and the Ethiopians shall be at his steps.

44 But tidings out of the east and out of the north shall trouble him: therefore he shall go forth with great fury to destroy, and utterly to make away many.

* "The king shall do according to his will,"—that is, the "king of fierce countenance," the personification of Mahometanism, who literally destroyed "the mighty and the holy people," putting an end to the Jewish kingdom of the Homerites in Arabia Felix, in a.c. 627, which had then existed for some 700 years, the last remnant of the Jews as a nation, and by whom their daily sacrifice was then finally taken away. See Milman's "History of the Jews," part xxii.

† See chap. viii. 19, "What shall be in the last end of the indignation."

shall be moved with choler, and shall come forth and fight with him, even with the king of the north : and he shall set forth a great multitude; but the multitude shall be given into his hand.* B.C. 217.

12 *And when he hath taken away the multitude, his heart shall be lifted up; and he shall cast down many ten thousands: but he shall not be strengthened by it.*

13 *For the king of the north shall return, and shall set forth a multitude greater than the former, and shall certainly come after certain years with a great army and with much riches.*

14 *And in those times there shall many stand up against the king of the south [PTOLEMY EPIPHANES]: also the robbers of thy people shall exalt themselves to establish the vision, but they shall fall.* 7th horn.
B.C. 205.

15 *So the king of the north shall come, and cast up a mount, and take the most fenced cities: and the arms of the south shall not withstand, neither his chosen people, neither shall there be any strength to withstand.*

ILLUSTRATION OF CHAPTER VIII.

CONCERNING THE KING OF FIERCE COUNTENANCE, OR THE WILFUL KING, ANTIOCHUS THE GREAT.

Text, Ch. xi. 36. *And the king shall do according to his will.*

Comment. Ch. xi. 16. *But he that cometh against him [ANTIOCHUS THE GREAT] shall do according to his own will, and none shall stand before him.* B.C. 200.

Text, Ch. xi. 41. *He shall enter also into the glorious land.*

Comment. Ch. xi. 16. *And he shall stand in the glorious land, which by his hand shall be consumed.*

17 *He shall also set his face to enter with the strength of his whole kingdom, and upright ones with him; thus shall he do: and he shall give him the daughter of women [CLEOPATRA†], corrupting her: but she shall not stand on his side, neither be for him.*

18 *After this shall he turn his face unto the isles, and shall take many: but a prince for his own behalf shall cause the reproach offered by him to cease; without his own reproach he shall cause it to turn upon him.*

* Battle of Raphia, B.C. 217, between Antiochus the Great and Philopator.

† Cleopatra, daughter of Antiochus the Great, wife of Epiphanes.

118 DANIEL'S PROPHECY OF THE LATTER DAYS.

45 And he shall plant the tabernacles of his palace between the seas in the glorious holy mountain ;* yet he shall come to his end, and none shall help him.

CHAP. XII. 1. And at that time shall Michael stand up, the great prince which standeth for the children of thy people: and there shall be a time of trouble, such as never was since there was a nation even to that same time: and at that time thy people shall be delivered, every one that shall be found written in the book.†

2 And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt.

3 And they that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament; and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars for ever and ever.

4 But thou, O Daniel, shut up the words, and seal the book, even to the time of the end: many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased.

5 Then I Daniel looked, and, behold, there stood other two, the one on this side of the bank of the river, and the other on that side of the bank of the river.

6 And one said to the man clothed in linen, which was upon the waters of the river, How long shall it be to the end of these wonders?

* No explanation of this passage can be found in the history of Antiochus. When Jerusalem, however, was taken by the Mahomedans under the Caliph Omar, in A.D. 637, the patriarch Sophronius, alluding to Dan. viii. 13, is said to have exclaimed, "The abomination of desolation is in the holy place."—*Gibbon*. The Mosque of Omar, or "the tabernacle of his palace," has stood "on the glorious holy mountain" even to this very day.

† "The Book." That is the book of life. Rev. xvii. 8. According to the paraphrase, The Book, or Scripture of Truth.

Text, Ch. xi. 45. Yet he shall come to his end and none shall help him.

Comment. Ch. xi. 19 *Then he shall turn his face toward the fort of his own land : but he shall stumble and fall, and not be found.** B.C. 188.

THE TIME OF TROUBLE. CHAPTER XII. 1.

IN THE DAYS OF ANTIOCHUS EPIPHANES, OR THE LITTLE HORN.

20 *Then shall stand up in his estate* [SELEUCUS PHILO-^{8th horn.}
PATOR] *a raiser of taxes in the glory of the kingdom : but*
within few days he shall be destroyed, neither in anger, nor
in battle. B.C. 187.

21 *And in his estate shall stand up a vile person* [ANTI-^{9th horn, or}
OCHUS EPIPHANES], *to whom they shall not give the honour*
of the kingdom : but he shall come in peaceably, and obtain
the kingdom by flatteries. B.C. 175.

22 *And with the arms of a flood shall they be overflowed*
from before him, and shall be broken ; yea, also the prince of
the covenant [the High Priest ONIAS].

23 *And after the league made with him he shall work*
deceitfully : for he shall come up, and shall become strong
with a small people.

24 *He shall enter peaceably even upon the fittest places*
of the province ; and he shall do that which his fathers have
not done, nor his fathers' fathers ; he shall scatter among
them the prey, and spoil, and riches ; yea, and he shall fore-
cast his devices against the strong holds, even for a time.

25 *And he shall stir up his power and his courage against*
the king of the south [PTOLEMY PHILOMETOR] *with a great*
army ; and the king of the south shall be stirred up to
battle with a very great and mighty army : but he shall not
stand : for they shall forecast devices against him. ^{10th horn.}
B.C. 181.

26 *Yea, they that feed of the portion of his meat shall*
destroy him, and his army shall overflow : and many shall
fall down slain.

27 *And both these kings' hearts shall be to do mischief,*
and they shall speak lies at one table ; but it shall not prosper :
for yet the end shall be at the time appointed.

* Antiochus the Great, slain while robbing the temple of Jupiter Belus, in Elymais.

120 DANIEL'S PROPHECY OF THE LATTER DAYS.

Ch. xii. 7 And I heard the man clothed in linen, which was upon the waters of the river, when he held up his right hand and his left hand unto heaven, and sware by him that liveth for ever that it shall be for a time, times, and an half; and when he shall have accomplished to scatter the power of the holy people, all these things shall be finished.

8 And I heard, but I understood not: then said I, O my Lord, what shall be the end of these things?

9 And he said, Go thy way, Daniel: for the words are closed up and sealed till the time of the end.

10 Many shall be purified, and made white, and tried; but the wicked shall do wickedly: and none of the wicked shall understand; but the wise shall understand.

11 And from the time that the daily sacrifice shall be taken away, and the abomination that maketh desolate set up, there shall be a thousand two hundred and ninety days.*

12 Blessed is he that waiteth, and cometh to the thousand three hundred and five and thirty days.*

13 But go thou thy way till the end be: for thou shalt rest and stand in thy lot at the end of the days.

END OF THE PROPHECY.

* When the wilful king is interpreted as representing the personification of the Mahometan apostasy, these periods of 1290 and 1335 days or years necessarily count from his time even beyond the present days. The Rabbinical paraphrase necessarily fixes them to the times of Antiochus, and thereby converts these two periods into literal days, so confusing the whole book.

28 *Then shall he return into his land with great riches ; and his heart shall be against the holy covenant : and he shall do exploits, and return to his own land.*

29 *At the time appointed he shall return, and come toward the south ; but it shall not be as the former, or as the latter.*

ILLUSTRATION OF CHAPTER IX.

IN THE TIME OF TROUBLE.

Text, Ch. ix. 27. And he shall confirm the covenant with many.

Comment. Ch. xi. 30. For the ships of Chittim shall come against him : therefore he shall be grieved, and return, and have indignation against the holy covenant : so shall he do ; he shall even return, and have intelligence with them that forsake the holy covenant.

Text, Ch. xi. 27. He shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease, and for the overspreading of abominations he shall make it desolate.

Comment. Ch. xi. 31. And arms shall stand on his part, and they shall pollute the sanctuary of strength, and shall take away the daily sacrifice, and they shall place the abomination that maketh desolate.

ILLUSTRATION OF CHAPTER XII.

IN THE TIME OF TROUBLE.

Text, Ch. xii. 10. The wicked shall do wickedly and none of the wicked shall understand.

Comment. Ch. xi. 32. And such as do wickedly against the covenant shall be corrupt by flatteries : but the people that do know their God shall be strong, and do exploits.

Text, Ch. xi. 10. But the wise shall understand.

Comment. Ch. xi. 33. And they that understand among the people shall instruct many : yet they shall fall by the sword, and by flame, by captivity, and by spoil, many days.

34 *Now when they shall fall, they shall be holpen with a little help : but many shall cleave to them with flatteries.*

Text, Ch. xi. 10. Many shall be purified and made white, and tried.

Comment. 35 And some of them of understanding shall fall, to try them, and to purge, and to make them white, even to the time of the end : because it is yet for a time appointed.

To sum up the arguments upon which the supposed interpolations in the text of Daniel appear to be established, it may be observed :

1st. That the questionable passages disturb the continuity of the prophecy. For the text of the latter half of chap. x. is full of repetition, and, as every reader must have remarked, verses 20, 21, and xi. 1, follow each other abruptly, unlike the clear style of Daniel in other parts of the book ; while, by separating the supposed comment from the text, the flow and the continuity of the prophecy is restored.

2nd. That they destroy the consistency of the prophecy. For the angel who declares that he is sent expressly to announce what shall befall the Jews in "the latter days,"—which days, therefore, must reach to the end of more than 2300 years from the date of the prophecy,—is, according to the present arrangement, made to announce things noted in the scripture of truth, that is to say, events which chiefly occurred within little more than 300 years from the beginning of the period ; and, though minute indeed in describing the persecutions of the comparatively *early* days of Antiochus, his description there suddenly and abruptly stops, without taking notice of the capture of Jerusalem by Pompey, by Herod, or by Titus, or of the persecutions which actually took place in the *latter* days,—of the Romans, of Mahomet, of the Crusaders, and of the Inquisition. Again, also while Daniel declares, "I heard, but I understood not," and "The words are closed up and sealed till the time of the end ;" ch. xii. 8, 9. The interpreter

incorrectly declares, ch. x. 1, "He understood the thing, and had understanding of the vision."

3rd. That they introduce Pharisaic opinions into holy Scripture. For the doctrine of the administration of God's government by the authority of angels, set over each kingdom of this world, who strive with each other according to the conflicting interests of their separate kingdoms, as gathered from chap. x. 13-20;—a doctrine, as Dr. Pusey observes,* "nowhere found out of Holy Scripture, and within Holy Scripture only found in Daniel;"—is, as observed by Bishop Horsley, "in truth nothing better than pagan polytheism, somewhat disguised and qualified."† When the passage, however, is viewed as mere comment, the doctrine appears to be the offspring of Rabbinism, not of the teaching of Daniel.‡

4th. That the parts objected to in chap. xi. were not treated by Jews as prophecy before the birth of Christ. For neither the authors of the two books of Maccabees, nor Josephus, have referred to this minute prophecy of the Syro-Grecian kings, while

* Pusey on Daniel, p. 362.

† Horsley's Sermons, vol. ii. p. 21.

‡ Concerning this strange doctrine, Dr. Pusey, p. 522, has been compelled in consistency with the authorised text to write: "Daniel taught, in the case of two great nations, Persia and Græcia, that they were under the care of eminent angels, princes with God. For the angels of Persia and Græcia were manifestly good angels, since they desired the welfare of their people, and they contended with Gabriel and Michael before God." Auberlen, equally carried away by the text, observes: "The glorious angel who appears to Daniel, tells him that for twenty-one days he struggled with the angel at the head of the Persian monarchy,

treating of that period of history, though both appear to refer to the words of chap. viii.

5th. That they destroy the perspicuity, unity, and sublimity of the book of Daniel, and contract the scope of the several prophecies contained in it. For thus, the 1290 days "from the time that the daily sacrifice shall be taken away, and the abomination of desolation set up," together with the 1335 days, spoken of immediately after, ch. xii. 11-12, must, as fairly argued by Mr. Desprez, necessarily refer to the same event spoken of just before in chap. xi. 31, in the reign of Antiochus, and therefore can only be interpreted of literal days; and thus also Daniel is made to hold out a special blessing to those who shall live patiently to the end of forty-five literal days more than their neighbours, after the restoration of the sanctuary. This principle of interpretation also, which must be applied throughout the book, leads to the conclusion, that all the prophecies of Daniel have already been long since fulfilled, though the mode of application of these

and that finally, by Michael's help, he subdued him." "That he had to enter upon a further struggle with that Persian angel, and that this would be succeeded by one with the Grecian." *Prophecies of Daniel. Trans.* p. 57. Bishop Horsley, on the other hand, saw the danger and falsehood of the doctrine,—“by whatever name,” he says, “these deputy gods be called, whether you call them gods, or demigods, or demons, or genii, or heroes, or angels, the difference is only in the name.” “Confidently I deny that a single text is to be found in holy writ which, rightly understood, gives the least countenance to the abominable doctrine of such a participation of the holy angels in God's government of the world.”

several periods cannot with any accuracy be explained on that assumption, and "the consummation" clearly has not yet come to pass.

6th. That it is difficult to account for the following series of repetitions of the same phrases, in the same order of continuity, except on the principle of text and running comment.

	TEXT.	1. On Chap. x.	COMMENT.	
	Ch. x. 9. When I heard the voice of his words.	Ch. x. 15. When he had spoken such words unto me.		
1	8. I retained no strength.	16. I have retained no strength.		2
	10. A hand touched me.	18. Then touched me one like, &c.		
	11. A man greatly beloved.	19. O man greatly beloved.		
	13. The prince of the kingdom of Persia.	20. The prince of Persia.		
	13. Michael one of the chief princes.	20. Michael your prince.		
3	Ch. xi. 2. I will show you the truth.	21. I will show thee that which is written in the Scripture of truth.		
2. On Chap. xi.				
5	Chap. xi. 36. Shall do according to his will.	Ch. xi. 16. Shall do according to his own will.		
	41. He shall enter also into the glorious land.	16. He shall stand in the glorious land.		
	45. He shall come to his end and none shall help him.	19. He shall stumble and fall and not be found.		
3. On Chap. ix.				
	Ch. ix. 27. Shall confirm the covenant.	30. Forsake the holy covenant.		
	27. Shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease.	31. Shall take away the daily sacrifice.		
	Ch. ix. 27. For the overspreading of abominations he shall make it desolate.	Ch. xi. 31. Shall place the abomination that maketh desolate.		4
4. On Chap. xii.				
6	Ch. xii. 10. The wicked shall do wickedly	32. And such as do wickedly, &c.		
	10. The wise shall understand.	33. They that understand, &c.		
	10. Shall be purified, and made white, and tried.	35. To try them and to purge, and to make them white.		
	9. Till the time of the end.	35. Till the time of the end.		

7th. That they disturb the reckoning of the chronology of the whole Bible. For, in the first place, the insertion of the one single verse, chap. x. 1, which, be it observed, is not written in the first person, as if by Daniel, and which fixes the date of that chapter to the third year of Cyrus, inverts, as we believe, the true order of the several chapters, by placing the date of chap. x. before that of chap. ix.: and thus makes a succession of eight kings of Persia between the time of the vision and the reign of Darius Codomanus, the last king conquered by Alexander. Whereas it is expressly declared by the prophet, that there shall stand up four kings only during that interval. Secondly, by comparing this verse with chap. xi. 1, which speaks of the "first year of Darius the Mede" as already past, a Median king, bearing the Persian title Darius, is here introduced as reigning before Cyrus, which is not only unsupported by the evidence of secular history, but is the cause of the most extreme confusion in this part of sacred history. For, thirdly, the Darius of the books of Haggai, Zechariah, and Ezra, who reigned at the close of seventy years of "indignation against Jerusalem," is thus assumed to be a different king from Darius who reigned at the close of seventy years of "desolation of Jerusalem,"* and the prayer of Daniel to God to restore and to build the sanctuary in the first year of Darius, is thus separated by many years from the command from God to restore and to build the sanctuary in the

* See pp. 57, 58.

second year of Darius. Fourthly, by the introduction of this Median Darius, who we affirm without fear of error never lived, as distinct from the Persian Darius, sometimes called the Mede, the historical book of Ezra is thrown into a state of absolute confusion. For Ezra tells us that the Temple of Jerusalem was completed in the sixth year of Darius, when Artach-Shashtha, that is Xerxes, was reigning with him, which was the case in B.C. 486, which date well agrees with the age of Daniel's Darius, who began to reign in Chaldea when about sixty-two years old, when that king is identified with the son of Hystaspes; but when the Median Darius, whose age was sixty-two, is supposed to be a different king from the Darius of Ezra, in conformity with chap. x. 1, and xi. 1, then must the building of the Temple be thrown back to the beginning instead of the end of the reign of Darius son of Hystaspes, when Artach-Shashtha, or Xerxes, was probably not even born. On the authority of these two verses only, all the commonly received interpretations of the book, both for and against its authenticity, have proceeded, when they assume that the unknown king, "Darius the Mede," was one who preceded Cyrus on the throne of Babylon, not one who came after him, though no such king is found in history.

8th. The wilful king of xi. 36-45, on whose removal the time of trouble and the awaking of many from sleep in the dust of the earth immediately takes place, xii. 1, 2, is apparently identified with

Antiochus the Great in xi. 16-19, which is necessarily a false interpretation, and the last of these passages, therefore, is not the writing of Daniel.

9th. If it is true that the fourth great empire predicted by Daniel, chap. ii. is the Roman empire, and that that empire was divided into ten parts, or horns, as described in chap. vii., then must the interpretation which identifies these ten horns with ten Syrian and Egyptian kings who reigned after Alexander, as set forth in chap. xi., be a false interpretation, and not, therefore, written by Daniel.

We return now to Mr. Desprez's interpretation of Daniel, chapter ix. The desecration of the city and the sanctuary, and the ceasing of the daily sacrifice, as foretold in this chapter by the prophet, denote, he says, "that memorable epoch in the annals of the holy people, which witnessed a cessation of the daily sacrifice for three, or for three and a half years; an event without parallel in Jewish history, and which can only be explained with fairness of the profanation of the temple by Antiochus." "If the passage is not explained by the cessation of the daily sacrifice caused by the Syrian oppressor, it can never be explained at all."*

To this observation we reply at once, that Mr. Desprez has for the moment overlooked the fact, that the event, though remarkable, has been paralleled in Jewish history, by a cessation of the daily sacrifice in the temple on a still more memorable occasion, that is, in the days when a Roman prince

* Desprez on Daniel, p. 185.

came against the city with his people, and not only made the city desolate for a time, but actually "destroyed the city and the sanctuary," in strict conformity with the words of Daniel; since which time till now it may be truly said, that "by the overspreading of abominations" Jerusalem has been made desolate, and trodden under foot, and closed against the worship of the "holy people." It must also be borne in mind that the ceasing of the daily sacrifice as connected with this final destruction of Jerusalem by Titus (Dan. ix. 26, 27), can, on the authority of Him whom we all adore, only be explained as occurring *after* the time of his ministry, and *not* therefore in the time of the Maccabees. For our Lord warned His disciples, saying, "When ye shall see the abomination of desolation, spoken of by Daniel the prophet, standing where it ought not, (let him that readeth understand), then let them that be in Judea flee to the mountains."* Now, the only words of Daniel which can possibly be here referred to by our Lord, as words of future import, especially if Dan. xi. 31, be removed, are those contained in ch. ix. 26, 27, thus declared by Him to have reference to the siege of Jerusalem by Titus.

Now, what does Josephus relate concerning the events of this siege? He writes, "Titus now commanded the soldiers who were with him to destroy the foundation of Antonia (the castle which overlooked the temple); and having called Josephus to him,—for he had been informed that on that very

* Mark, xiii. 14.

day, being the 17th day of Panemus (Tamuz), that which is called the perpetual sacrifice (ἐνδελεισμὸν καλούμενον) had been discontinued for want of men to offer it, and that the people were thereby grievously cast down in spirit,"*—directed him to implore those in possession of the temple no longer to pollute it by bloodshed, and to propose to them that they might select whom they pleased to offer for them the sacrifices thus discontinued. For Titus was truly anxious to save the temple from destruction. Here, then, is a parallel event to that which happened in the days of Antiochus. Mr. Desprez, therefore, is not only not justified in saying that the event foretold by Daniel can never be explained except in the manner he proposes, but the full weight of our Lord's evidence is thus absolutely set against his mode of explanation.

There is one other preliminary remark which we would make before examining Mr. Desprez's arithmetical exposition of the "Seventy Weeks." He suggests that the book of Daniel "may be partly (that is, as regards the narrative) a compilation and rearrangement of more ancient annals, and partly (that is, as regards the prophecies) the original composition of some learned and pious Jew who lived at a period subsequent to the *scenes* he describes; probably whilst his countrymen were still engaged in their patriotic struggle against Demetrius, and following up the advantages they had won from Antiochus Epiphanes;"† that is to say, between the

* Josephus, "Bell. Jud." vi. 2. † P. 30.

death of Judas Maccabeus in B.C. 161, and the year B.C. 143, when all persecution ceased.*

"It will not require," he adds, "much argument to show that such a book, at such a time, may have afforded *material aid and encouragement* to the Jewish patriots;" "may have reminded them that the Lord knows how to deliver His servants, whether from a 'burning fiery furnace,' or from excruciating torture." This idea, that the forged prophecies of the book were now first fitted together with older genuine legends, with the object of stimulating the valour of the patriots, is the view generally taken by writers of this class on the book of Daniel; and contrasts with the apparently more simple proposition which we have advanced, that the genuine prophecies of Daniel now first began to attract universal attention as apparently literally coming to pass, and that the fact of their fulfilment was considered sufficiently remarkable to justify their publication, with a comment, applying them to the events of the day. There is, indeed, good ground for believing, with Mr. Desprez, that the book of Daniel was thus made use of as an instrument in encouraging the Jewish patriots during their eventful struggle; and it is specially to the noble steadfastness and endurance of the three young princes, Hananiah, Mishael, and Azariah, when about to be cast into the flames, and to the patient resignation of Daniel when about to be cast into the den of lions, to which he must allude, when

* 1 Macc. xiii. 41.

speaking of the encouragement to be derived from the *scenes* described by the writer. We agree with him as to the value of these scenes for the assumed purpose, and also of some of the prophecies, when woven into the times of Antiochus by means of chap. xi. but how can it be shown that the narratives were first brought to light in the time of Demetrius? and how could such prophecies, if chap. xi. is mere comment, as we think we have shown, add to the effect of the narratives in the way of encouraging the patriots? Certainly the prophecy of the seventy weeks, chap. ix., our immediate subject, would have afforded them anything but encouragement, supposing it merely to have informed the patriots that the anointed Judas had just been "cut off, and the daily sacrifice abolished, in literal accordance with this newly discovered prophecy, and that desolations were determined "even until the consummation," then leaving off abruptly, without one word of consolation. What also could the compiler be supposed to have pointed at when speaking of the stone cut out of the mountain without hands?

We will not dwell upon the impiety and imprudence of this supposed "pious" Jew, thus putting into the mouth of God prophecies of events only just come to pass, and still fresh in the memory of his readers, and thus producing them as new revelations to the people, or upon the grossness of a people, who could be imposed upon by such palpable forgery. There is such glaring improbability in all this as to

destroy any such incongruous theory. But the difficulty we would point out lies here : That the noble Mattathias, father of Judas Maccabeus, who died in the year B.C. 168, and who was the first to rouse his countrymen to resistance against Antiochus, actually had on his death-bed encouraged his sons "to be valiant and show themselves men," by reminding them of the steadfastness of former Jewish worthies; pointing out how "Ananias, Azarias, and Misael, by believing were saved out of the flame;" and how "Daniel, for his innocency, was delivered from the mouth of lions." * So that Mattathias, in B.C. 168, seven years before the death of Judas, and before the time of the supposed forgeries, had referred to a history then extant, and, moreover, a history which we must presume had been composed before his time, which contained the very *scenes* which Mr. Desprez and other critics suggest were brought forward in their present shape some ten years later, for the first time, and for the special encouragement of those living under Demetrius. In the face of this evidence, what ground, we are compelled to ask, have these critics, beyond their own imagination, for teaching that Daniel, chap. iii. or chap. vi., were first brought forward after the year B.C. 161? And if there is no ground for such teaching as regards chap. iii. then also none as regards chap. i., in which is explained how these four holy men came to be placed in the position referred to by Mattathias; and again, if not as regards chap. vi., then also not as regards

* 1 Macc. ii. 59, 60.

chap. v., which leads to it. Chap. ix., also, *prima facie*, is exempt from the supposition, as affording nothing but discouragement to those who should then read it, and so on. So that, in fact, there appears to be but small reason, if any, on the score of advantage to the patriotic cause for the composition of the prophecies of Daniel, excepting only chap. xi. after the year B.C. 161, and sufficient reason, on the contrary, for believing that a book containing the *scenes* referred to was, as it professes to have been, written long before B.C. 168. We take it for granted that the writer of the first book of the Maccabees is not charged with any piously-fraudulent intentions. Here, then, are difficulties, *in limine*, which to an ordinary writer seem to be insuperable in the way of the supposition that the book in general was forged after the reign of Antiochus. Nevertheless, if philosophers are right in teaching us that prophecy is out of place in the ways of God towards man, and if they can really show that the precise and plain wording of Daniel ix. can be so fitted with exactness to the time and the events of the reign of Antiochus, as not to be mistaken, then shall we be ready to recall and reconsider the apparently inevitable conclusions at which we have thus far arrived.

We proceed, therefore, to set forth briefly the three enigmatical expositions by which sceptical commentators pride themselves upon having proved, beyond all fair question, that the seventy weeks were fulfilled in the times of Antiochus.

ENIGMA No. 1.

SEVENTY WEEKS EQUAL TO 429 YEARS.

Mr. Desprez sets out with the intention "to keep imagination, which is apt to run wild on prophetic subjects, within due bounds, and to abide by the rules of sound and careful criticism."* We would ask him to consider how far imagination has been allowed to run wild, or has been restrained, in the following summary of his own observations:—

"On the supposition," says Mr. Desprez, "that the 'seven weeks' represent fifty-four years, from the *assault* upon Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar, in B.C. 590, to the restoration by Zerubbabel in the first year of Cyrus, B.C. 536; that the 'threescore and two weeks,' starting *from the same terminus a quo*, represent 429 years, to the death of Judas Maccabeus in B.C. 161, to which must be *added* the 'one week,' significant of a period of seven years, during which Antiochus makes a covenant with the apostate Jews"—meaning by one week "added" to, one week *included within* the threescore and two—"we have arrived at a total of $54 + 429 + 7 = 490$ years. Owing to the uncertain character of biblical chronology, it is possible that an approximation to complete numerical exactness is alone attainable; sufficient agreement, however, may be discernible

* Page 1.

between the prophetic records and their historical fulfilments to satisfy the general requirements of the arithmetical problem." *

The reader will no doubt be amused at this ingenious and complacent method of turning seventy weeks of years, or 490 years, into a period of 429 years, the exact interval between the two extreme dates. He will be curious also to know how the explicit words, "from the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem," become transmuted into the command of Nebuchadnezzar to assault Jerusalem; for which explanation, however, our limits compel us to refer to Mr. Desprez's ingenious work. We can only observe, that we are anything but convinced or satisfied with the soundness of this enigmatical mode of interpretation; nor do we think, with Mr. Desprez, that the exegesis of this mysterious volume is thus to be placed, "upon a basis that shall stand." † The enigma may thus be reduced:—

$$\begin{array}{rclcl}
 7 \text{ weeks, or } 49 \text{ years} & = & 54 \text{ years, counted from B.C. 590} \\
 62 \text{ ,, } 434 \text{ ,,} & = & 429 \text{ ,, do. do.} \\
 1 \text{ ,, } 7 \text{ ,,} & = & 7 \text{ ,, ending B.C. 161} \\
 \hline
 70 \text{ weeks, or } 490 \text{ years} & = & 490 \text{ years, comprised within 429 yrs.}
 \end{array}$$

If this were the meaning of the supposed forger of this prophecy, we cannot comprehend why he should not have written plainly, "from the going forth of the command to *assault* Jerusalem unto

* Page 186.

† Page 187.

the cutting off of Messiah the Prince, shall be about *sixty-one* weeks." The prophet, however, has not so written.

ENIGMA No. 2.

SEVENTY WEEKS EQUAL TO 441 YEARS.

Other writers, such as Harduin, Ekerman, Eichhorn, Maurer, Hitzig, Wieseler,—we take the names from Dr. Pusey's analytical list *—have seen in the anointing of "the holy of holies" by Judas Maccabeus in the year B.C. 165, that is, in the re-consecration of the temple of Jerusalem after its profanation, the prominent event which filled the mind of the writer of the seventy weeks' prophecy. They count, therefore, from the year B.C. 606, the supposed year of Daniel's captivity, down to the year B.C. 165, a period of exactly 441 years.

Now from B.C. 606 to B.C. 536, the supposed first year of the anointed Cyrus, is a period of just seventy years. This interval is assumed, therefore, though erroneously, to represent the seventy years of "desolation" of Jerusalem of which Daniel speaks, and at the end of which time he prays for a restoration of the sanctuary. The angel, it is said, replies to him that, not seventy years, but seven times seventy years is the time appointed, so that these 490 years must be considered merely as a prolongation of the original

* Pusey on "Daniel," p. 215.

“seventy,” and to be counted, therefore, from the same year B.C. 606. It matters not that Daniel speaks emphatically of the command to build Jerusalem as the terminus *a quo* to be adhered to; it is determined by these critics, in spite of so trifling an obstacle, that the 490 years ought to begin in B.C. 606, and end with anointing the “holy of holies” in B.C. 165. The whole period, however, is, unfortunately, only 441, not 490 years. This matters not. The fault is with the prophet, not in the exposition. It would be tedious beyond measure to go through the shifts and shuffles of the promoters of this arrangement, in their endeavours to show how seven weeks, or forty-nine years, can be supposed to be represented by seventy, thus ending with Cyrus. It is quite clear that this explanation cannot be made to tally with the prophecy. It does not even satisfy those who are inclined to favour the same general view of the subject.

7 weeks, or 49 years, explained to be = 70 years.				
62	„	434	„	counted from B.C. 606
1	„	7	„	from B.C. 172 to 165
<hr/>				
70 weeks, or 490 years, comprised within . . . 441 years.				

There were those, no doubt, in the days of the Maccabees who would have been inclined to have entertained even such a perversion of the prophecy as this. But we know that the day for such interpretations had gone by at the commencement of the Christian era. For it was from this prophecy of Daniel (ix.), and from this prophecy only, that

pious Jews were led, as we read, at that time to collect about the temple, waiting in daily expectation of the appearance of the Christ.

Thus far, at least, we assume that the reader will feel disinclined to agree with Dr. Williams, "that it is clear beyond fair doubt that the period of weeks ended in the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes." Let us proceed, then, to examine another of these precious enigmatical expositions, by which he would seem to have arrived at this conviction.

ENIGMA No. 3.

SEVENTY WEEKS EQUAL TO 424 YEARS.

In the previous exposition the seventy years of "desolations of Jerusalem" (ix. 2) are reckoned from the fourth year of Jehoiakim, B.C. 606, that is, from a point of time eighteen years before Jerusalem was made desolate by Nebuchadnezzar. This manifest contradiction has proved unsatisfactory to most candid inquirers. Many eminent expositors, therefore, such as Bertholt, Bleek, Rosenmüller, Ewald, and others, have proposed to count correctly, with Daniel, the seventy years of desolation of Jerusalem from the year when the city was made desolate by Nebuchadnezzar (2 Chron. xxxvi. 20, 21), an event commonly placed in the year B.C. 588. Now allowing, for the sake of argument, with these writers, that it had been announced to Daniel, in answer to his prayer, that Jeremiah's "seventy years" of desolation

were to be lengthened out into 490 years, this lengthened period would thus properly commence from the year B.C. 588. This arrangement seems at first sight to be an improvement on the last. For, if we count seven weeks, or forty-nine years, from B.C. 588 exclusively, we come to the year B.C. 538, the commonly received date of the first year of Cyrus at Babylon, and this appearance of a Messiah at the expiration of "seven weeks" is considered to be highly remarkable and satisfactory, and something indeed which could hardly be looked upon as accidental. The cutting off of Messiah, however, at the end of $7 + 62$ weeks, in this case, must of course have reference to some second Messiah in the days of the Maccabees, which is not quite so satisfactory.

Moreover, the difficulty still remains, that, counting from the year B.C. 588 to B.C. 164, the year of the death of Antiochus, the anointed prince, and soon after the anointing of the "holy of holies" by Judas, is exactly 424 years, not 490, that is, nearly sixty-one weeks, and not "seventy," nor "threescore and two," nor "seven and threescore and two," = 483, nor any period named by the prophet. To remedy this defect it is proposed, and even Ewald lends his name to the extraordinary suggestion, that the seventy sabbaths which are comprehended in seventy weeks are in this instance intended to be thrown out of the calculation altogether, and that the enigmatical writer of the book really intended to express by the term "seventy weeks," not 490, but

420 years, which number does not fall far short of the actual interval of 424 years.

Some such explanation as this appears to be that which comes home to the mind of Dr. Williams as the most probable explanation of the words of the prophecy, and as fixing the fulfilment of the weeks beyond fair doubt in the reign of Antiochus. He observes,*—"It can hardly be accidental that just forty-nine or fifty years intervene between the *destruction* at the commencement of the captivity and the advent of Cyrus in Babylon, or the restoration under Zerubbabel, whether we follow the suggestion of Isaiah in calling Cyrus the Anointed, or that of Zechariah in applying the term to Zerubbabel." In reply to this remark we can only repeat the question,—How is it possible that the words "to bring back the captivity, and to restore Jerusalem"—we make use of Dr. Williams' own translation†—can, by any conceivable accident, barring the insanity of the interpreter, be mistaken to represent "to go into captivity and to destroy Jerusalem," which were the marked features of the year B.C. 588?

Again he observes, "It can hardly be accidental that from certain epochs of the captivity to points in the Maccabean struggle should be 434 years." Now allowing for a moment that "to destroy," and "to restore," may be taken as equivalent terms, we agree with Dr. Williams that there may be something observable in the assumed fact that 434

* Introduction to Desprez's "Daniel," p. xlii.

† P. xlii.

years, counted, not from B.C. 588, but from B.C. 608, should be found to end in the death of the anointed priest Onias, say in B.C. 174. Such, however, is not really the fact. For though apparently so, according to the common Biblical reckoning, we shall endeavour to show in the course of the following pages that the coincidence is merely the result of a mode of computation introduced by the Rabbinical paraphrast: that neither B.C. 588, nor B.C. 608, is the true date of the event to which it is attached: and that the interval between the supposed first captivity in the reign of Jehoiakim and the death of Onias is at most a period of 408 years, not of 434, nor of 441 years.

Again, Dr. Williams thinks that "the possibility of the omission of Sabbatical years"—from the period of seventy Sabbatical weeks—"opens room for discrepancy," that is, for contradiction between Daniel's words and facts. Now any supposition of this sort may be possible on the assumption that the words are forged. But if there is one thing in this great prophecy which is definite, and worthy of accurate explanation, it is its marked and inseparable connexion with the Sabbatical cycle. Daniel's periods are expressed in "weeks," not in years. It is the Sabbath which marks the division of days or years into weeks, and to leave out Sabbaths therefore, would be to destroy any computation by weeks. Considering also that it was, amongst other neglects, for the neglect of the Sabbatical years, and, as expressly stated, "that the land

might enjoy her Sabbaths," that the seventy years of desolation had been inflicted, it would certainly be something remarkable in the ways of God towards His people, if after commanding them through Moses to keep a perpetual observance of "Sabbaths of years" (Lev. xxv. 2-10), that now, when "seventy weeks," or seventy "Sabbaths of years," were announced as determined on the people and the holy city, till the fulfilment of their great expectation, the appearance of Messiah the Prince, it should for the first time be put forth by His prophet, or by any pretended prophet, that the computation of weeks should be made exclusive of Sabbaths. This is perhaps the most astonishing and ill-conceived suggestion of all to which this class of interpreters has been driven, in the endeavour to fit the reckoning of the supposed impostor to the historical facts before him. The scheme may be thus reduced :—

7 weeks, or	49 years	=	49 years counted from	B.C. 588
			to first of Cyrus	B.C. 538
62	„	434	„	= 364 „ ending in B.C. 175
1	„	7	„	= 11 „ ending in B.C. 164
<hr/>				
70 weeks, or	490 years	=	424 + 70 Sabbaths	= 494 = 424

Such then is the result of our examination of the enigmatical mode of explanation of the prophecy. It is sufficiently clear that the figures cannot be made to correspond with the facts, when the prophecy is interpreted as referring to Antiochus. It is hardly worth while to take into considera-

tion whether this may be accounted for on the supposition that the supposed writer of the prophecy was ignorant of history, considering that we believe the chronology of those by whom these enigmatical figures have been put together to be itself entirely corrupt. Be that, however, as it may, no candid inquirer, we think, will admit that there is any justification for Dr. Williams' assertion to be derived from either of these enigmatical interpretations.

From the foregoing investigation then of commentaries on the book of Daniel, it would appear that the book has suffered in times past, as much, if not more, from the hands of zealous or of careless friends, as it has from the enmity of open foes; that large interpolations, written with no sinister purpose, but with the honest intention of illustrating the prophet's words, had been introduced into the text, some time before the Christian era, that is to say, before the publication of the Greek translation called the LXX., and that those interpolations had become so fixed and recognised in all copies used in the early Christian Church, as to have been adopted even into the later and revised copies of Theodotion, and of other translators. And thus the true text of Daniel has been handed down to us obscured and mystified by mere words of comment; while those who would have expounded and made plain the text have literally, though unintentionally, fulfilled the words addressed to the prophet: "Shut up the words, and seal the book;" "For the words are closed up and sealed till the

time of the end." xii. 4, 9. Again, we have seen how a succession of rabbis, priests, philosophers, and critics, have, from time to time, set their minds to expound the hidden mystery of the prophecy of the "Seventy Weeks," that prophecy of prophecies, which nevertheless still lies wrapped in obscurity amongst the treasures of this wondrous book; how, by the application of questionable heathen chronology to the interpretation of sacred numbers, which run in measured cycles throughout Holy Scripture, the true import of Daniel's periods has become so distorted and obscured, as to leave the impression upon many a reverent mind, that the periods, if indeed prophetic, are beyond the reach of human interpretation; and how at length the book has been suffered to fall into the merciless hands of critics, who have dragged it in triumph through the mire, as a detected piece of fraud, and worthy only to be cast amidst the heap of pious impositions by which mankind have been from time to time misled.

Yet if it is true, as we trust that we have succeeded in showing, that the text of the book is corrupt and has been tampered with by unskilful hands, then is it clear, not only that it is not profane, but, on the contrary, that it is the bounden duty of all who possess the power, to question, scrutinize, and dissect each chapter and sentence of the book, with the view, if possible, of restoring the integrity of the inspired text. We have less reason to be unthankful, than to be ashamed, at having thus been forced

unwillingly to recognise corruption in this sacred writing by the bold and sometimes impious remarks of sceptical inquirers. But having at length thus stumbled on the truth, we trust that investigation will be carried henceforth fearlessly to the full extent; not indeed, by the rude hands of those who love dissection merely for dissection's sake, nor by the hands of those "blind leaders of the blind, who neither enter in themselves, nor suffer those who would to enter in" to perform the sacred task. We submit that in this one instance at least, the "*quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*," of schoolmen,—that axiom by which every ancient error might be perpetuated—may be laid aside; that the book should be submitted for revision to the careful hands of those to whom the oracles of God were formerly entrusted, should undergo the scrutiny of God's own holy people, who, in times of deepest ignorance and darkness, have cherished with scrupulous faith each syllable and letter of the supposed sacred text, and who, in these days of enlightenment, with their knowledge of the language and of Hebrew modes of comment, may yet be able to throw light upon the way in which, and the extent to which, corruption has crept in. Perchance, while lifting off the veil with which, in days now to be forgotten, they themselves have but too carefully shrouded from their eyes the divine message of the prophet, they may be led to perceive, how simply and how precisely his predictions concerning their Messiah have been fulfilled, in

the birth and cutting off of Him, in whom e'en now the nations of the earth are blest, who "came unto His own, and His own received Him not," and who, when in wilful blindness they rejected, reviled, and crucified Him, exclaimed in tender mercy on the cross, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do."

We now proceed to point out the manner in which the prophecy appears to us to have been literally fulfilled.

DANIEL'S PROPHECY OF MESSIAH

THE PRINCE.

WHILE thus, as we have seen, there were amongst the scribes and rulers at Jerusalem, those through whom the words of Daniel concerning the Messiah had become obscured, and who by comment and interpretation had truly made "the word of God of none effect," there were others there and elsewhere, by whom the prophecy of ch. ix. was treated with more faithful and true interpretation. It was at Babylon, and as "chief of the governors over all the wise men of Babylon," that the revelation had been made to Daniel, and it is chiefly to the Jews of the dispersion, probably, that we owe that, the true and literal meaning of the prophecy had not been entirely lost, at the time of the birth of our Lord. Unbiased by events which had occurred at Jerusalem in the reign of Antiochus, in which they had taken no part, they clearly saw that the scope of the prophecy reached far beyond the events of that early date, and, as testified by Tacitus and Suetonius, the Roman historians, an ancient and unvarying tradition had prevailed, throughout the East, that at that time some one rising in Judæa should obtain dominion. So prepared, indeed, and waiting, were they, for the

great event, that in the course of not many months after His birth, we find wise men journeying from the East to Judæa, bearing kingly gifts, to present to him who was *born* King of the Jews, the star of whose nativity they had seen in the East.

Now it is to be remarked particularly, that it was to the *birth* of a prince that the thoughts of pious men at that time were turned in Jerusalem. It had been foretold that the expected prince should be *born* of the house of David; and the inquiry made of the chief priests and scribes by Herod was, "where Christ should be *born*," Matt. ii. 4. The words of Isaiah—"Unto us a child is *born*, unto us a son is given," had as we learn from the Targum of Jonathan, been applied by Jews themselves to the expected Messiah. The universal expectation was, that the prophecies concerning him should be fulfilled by the *birth* of a prince of the house of David, in the town of Bethlehem. The appellation by which this expected prince was commonly referred to was "Messias," or "the Messias," or "Χριστὸς Κύριος," words clearly adopted with reference to the Hebrew expression "Mashiach Nagid" of Daniel:* devout men and women were collected about the temple, waiting daily the appearance of this Prince, who should save them from their enemies, and all who hated and

* Though the word מָלִיךְ is not properly translated Κύριος though indeed so paraphrased in the LXX translation, the evidence is abundant that the expected Messiah was then looked upon as the Lord Himself. Theodotion writes Χριστοῦ ἡγουμένου.

oppressed them ; and so nearly was the time of His arrival fixed and known in Jerusalem, that to one aged priest in particular, it had been revealed that he should not see death till he had seen the Lord's Christ, *Χριστὸς Κύριος*.*

Such then being the state of ferment and expectation at Jerusalem, we learn from St. Luke, that, while certain shepherds were keeping watch over their flocks by night, a heavenly messenger suddenly announced to them : "This day is *born* unto you, in the city of David, a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord," *Χριστὸς Κύριος* ; or, in other words, this day is born unto you, the expected "Mashiach Nagid." Thus, by every conceivable form of declaration, first by announcement to David and Isaiah of old, then to Mary and to Simeon not long before the event, and lastly to the shepherds on the very day of the birth, it was proclaimed, that in the birth of the Messiah, the glorious words of the prophets had been and were to be fulfilled. Seeing then that the expectation was thus literally fulfilled in the *birth* of a prince of the house of David, we submit that it is neither reasonable nor in conformity with Scripture, to pass over the birth of Christ in the reign of Augustus, and to look onward to the reign of Tiberius, to the baptism of Christ, as Dr. Pusey and almost all other interpreters have proposed, for the fulfilment of this prophecy.† The

* Luke, ii. 26.

† Sir Isaac Newton, and some few other interpreters, have seen that the fulfilment of the prophecy took place in the birth

words of the holy angel could hardly have more distinctly proclaimed, "The Seventy Weeks' prophecy of Daniel concerning the Messiah, is this day fulfilled by the *birth* of Christ the Lord in Bethlehem." We have no hesitation, therefore, in affirming, that the consistency of Scripture is to be maintained only by taking the birth of Christ, and not his baptism, nor his death, as the *terminus ad quem* of the prophecy concerning Messiah the Prince.

Taking then the birth of Christ as the basis of our interpretation, let it be observed, as we proceed, how plainly and naturally each separate period comprised within the seventy weeks falls into its own true position, and with what exactness every single date required for the verification of this precise numerical prediction has been, either directly or indirectly, recorded in sacred history.

For if "Jesus began to be about thirty years of age," as we are told, in the fifteenth year of Tiberius Cæsar,* at the time of his baptism, say after the month of August in which month the reign of Tiberius began, and before the winter of A.D. 28 set in, then must the birth of Christ have taken place about the autumn or winter of the year B.C. 3, that is to say, at the beginning of the Sabbatical year B.C. 3-2, in the year 4711 of the Julian period, which is in accordance with the opinion of Scaliger,† after much consideration of the subject: and if

of Christ, though unable fully to explain the several periods of weeks.

* Luke, iii. 1.

† De Emend. Temp. p. 551.

we count upwards from that date seventy Sabbatical weeks, or 490 years, we come to the Sabbatical year B.C. 493-2, which falls, as it ought to fall, in the reign of Darius the son of Hystaspes, king of Persia, in agreement with Daniel's words.

But if the end of the seventy weeks is thus precisely fixed by sacred record in the Sabbatical year B.C. 3, the beginning of the period, it appears, is fixed by Scripture with equal precision: for Daniel, who was living at the beginning of the period, tells us that it was "in the first year of Darius, son of Ahasuerus, of the seed of the Medes, what time he was set over the realm of the Chaldeans," that he saw this vision. And he elsewhere tells us that the first year of that king's reign over Babylon was when he was "about threescore and two years old."* We know of no reason which can be assigned why the age of the king should be so precisely recorded, if not for the purpose of marking, though indirectly, the exact year of the delivery of this all-important prophecy; but if intended so to mark that event, then ought we to find, if our principle of interpretation is the true one, that Darius, son of Hystaspes, who we assume to be the same as Darius son of Ahasuerus, was about sixty-two years old in the Sabbatical year B.C. 493-2.

Now Ctesias, who lived at the court of Persia, and who is by far the best authority concerning the

* Dan. v. 31.

reigns of the kings of Persia, which we possess, has left a record that Darius died at the age of seventy-two,* and Herodotus asserts that he died in the fifth year after the battle of Marathon, that is, in B.C. 485. If then we follow the reckoning of Herodotus, and Darius was seventy-two in B.C. 485, he must have been sixty-two years old in the year B.C. 495, and therefore "*about* threescore and two years old," that is in his sixty-third year, in B.C. 494. This computation may be thought sufficiently near to satisfy those who follow Herodotus, and who adopt the reckoning of Archbishop Ussher, who places the birth of Christ in B.C. 4. For thus, 490 years added to B.C. 4 would bring them to the sixty-third year of the age of Darius; making, however, the date of the prophecy and the birth of Christ thus to fall each one year too early, that is in each case before the Sabbatical year commenced. We are, however, satisfied that Herodotus is here slightly in error.

Both Herodotus and Ctesias are agreed that Xerxes, the son of Darius, came to the throne in the year B.C. 486, by the direct appointment of his father while yet alive, as related by the former of these historians. The difference between them is that Herodotus assigns thirty-six years to the reign of Darius ending in the accession of Xerxes, Ctesias more correctly, we believe, reckons only thirty-one years. Thus, according to Ctesias, Darius came to the throne in the year B.C. 517, which is the very date

* Ctes. Frag. Muller, p. 49.

inscribed in the Parian chronicle as that of his first year; and this date also agrees with a still extant tablet in the Serapeum at Memphis, which records the birth of an Apis in the fifth year of Cambyses (*i.e.* over Egypt*), which fell in B.C. 521, and its death at the age of seven years and eight months, in the fourth year of Darius, that is in B.C. 514, thus making the first year of his reign B.C. 517. Nevertheless, Herodotus is unquestionably right in assigning thirty-six years to the reign of Darius, for this year of his reign is found in Egyptian records,† so that he must, if Ctesias is correct, have died in the year B.C. 482, having completed the seventy-second year of his age in that year. If so, his age would have been "about threescore and two," in the course of the Sabbatical year B.C. 493-2. This we believe to be the true reckoning of his reign, and the result is that the vision in which the prophecy of the seventy weeks was revealed to Daniel, was probably seen in the early part of the year B.C. 492, just seventy Sabbatical weeks before the birth of Christ, and those indeed, as we believe, the first seventy weeks of a great period of weeks comprehending the future destinies of the Jews commencing from the date of this vision.

Here let us pause for a moment to consider one or two interesting results to be derived from this precise determination of the date of the delivery of

* See a paper by the author on this subject, "Journ. Sac. Lit." Oct. 1864.

† Vol. II. part 3, "Transactions of the Chronological Institute."

this prophecy. What are the words of the holy angel to Daniel? "Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people and upon thy holy city." Now what is the meaning of the expression "holy city?" When did Jerusalem first become the "holy city?" Not when David conquered this stronghold from the Jebusites. Not when he fixed his palace on the Mount of Zion. But Jerusalem became the "holy city" when Solomon dedicated his temple to Jehovah, when the cloud descended and filled the house, and when the city and the sanctuary together constituted the "holy city." Now it is not of Jerusalem, but of the "holy city" that the prophet speaks, and we know that from the time of the dedication of the temple in the twelfth year of Solomon to the destruction of the city and the sanctuary in the reign of Zedekiah was exactly 420 years, and that when these years are added to the seventy years of desolation of the city, or the seventy years during which the land enjoyed her neglected sabbaths, ending about the first year of Darius son of Ahasuerus, they form a period of 490 years, or seventy weeks. So that reckoning in the Era of the "holy city," or in the Era of the first temple, the words of the prophecy delivered to Daniel in B.C. 492 were first fulfilled at the completion of the 490th year of that Era; while counting from the same point to the birth of Christ they were a second time fulfilled in a period of exactly the same length of time. This sixty-second year then of the age of Darius, the son of Hystaspes, thus incidentally pre-

served in the Book of Daniel, is in fact for chronological purposes the most important date in all Scripture. It is the pivot upon which all sacred chronology turns. By means of it we are enabled to compute with exactness upwards and downwards, either to the building of the temple, or to the birth of Christ, and to reckon also within strictly defined limits the hitherto unknown years of the period of the Jubilee; and when taken in conjunction with the period of 480 years recorded in 1 Kings, vi. 2, we mount with exactness even to the year of the exodus, to a point reaching nearly twice the distance of the period of the Olympiads.

But if this date B.C. 492 be the true date of Daniel's vision in the reign of Darius, then must the destruction and the "desolations of Jerusalem," in the reign of Nebuchadnezzar, have commenced just seventy years before this well-defined point of time; because Daniel, at the very time of the vision, declared that he then "understood by books the number of the years whereof the word of the Lord came to Jeremiah the prophet that he would accomplish seventy years in the desolations of Jerusalem," chap. ix. 2, and therefore prayed for the immediate restoration of the sanctuary. Now seventy years added to the year B.C. 492-3 brings us to the year B.C. 563, in which year, therefore, unless our principle of interpretation is erroneous, we ought to find from history that Jerusalem was taken by Nebuchadnezzar and made desolate. On the contrary, however, as we have seen, both

believers and unbelievers have, with one consent, agreed to fix the date of the fall of Jerusalem in the year B.C. 588. If tested, therefore, by the rule of "*quod semper, quod ab omnibus*," we fear that a synod of chronologists would be inclined to pronounce decidedly against the interpretation we have now advanced. Nevertheless, we are satisfied that this is the true date of the destruction of Jerusalem by the Chaldeans. For it cannot be by chance that the Jewish historian Demetrius, who wrote a history of the kings of Judæa in the reign of Ptolemy Philopator, about 220 years before the Christian era, should have recorded that the last carrying away of captives from Jerusalem by king Nebuchadnezzar mentioned in Scripture, which we learn from the prophet Jeremiah was in the twenty-third year of that king's reign,* took place in the year B.C. 560, that is, as the author writes, 338 years and three months before Ptolemy Philopator began to reign in B.C. 222, from which we learn that the latter part of the nineteenth year of the reign of Nebuchadnezzar in which Jerusalem was destroyed, may, by this computation, have fallen in B.C. 563; and thus, on the authority of this Jewish historian, we are justified in placing the beginning of the "desolations of Jerusalem" in B.C. 563, and the close of the desolations in the sabbatical year B.C. 493-2, and therefore also the vision of Daniel in that year, as before determined.

* Jer. lii. 30.

But what historian it may be asked will support Demetrius in this computation? We reply that it is remarkably confirmed by a passage in the gospel of St. Matthew, who seems to found upon this particular date, which has been fortunately preserved,* a peculiar genealogical computation which can in no other way be understood. For he reckons that "from the carrying away into Babylon unto Christ are fourteen generations." (Matt. i. 17.) But how fourteen generations? We know from St. Luke that there were no less than twenty-two generations from father to son between the times mentioned. It is not, therefore, by such generations that Matthew counts; on the other hand, we know that throughout the east a generation was counted as forty years. Numerous instances to this effect may be found in Scripture, as also a remarkable one in the "Zendavesta."† Now fourteen times forty years is a period of exactly 560 years, which added to the birth of Christ B.C. 3, brings us to the very year B.C. 563, for the carrying away into captivity at the destruction of Jerusalem, to which, therefore, St. Matthew must have referred.

But now, again, our reckoning comes into direct collision with modern received chronology, and has to undergo the test of an authority supposed by

* Preserved amongst other fragments of chronology by Clem. Alex. Strom. 1.

† 2nd Fargard, 134. "Every forty years two human beings are born of every two human beings, a pair, one male and one female child."

many to be of very great weight, we mean the well-known Canon of Ptolemy, the Alexandrian astronomer. For if the nineteenth year of Nebuchadnezzar fell as we have said in B.C. 563, then must his first year of course have fallen in the year B.C. 582, which is directly opposed by the authority of this Canon, which places his accession in B.C. 604, a date accepted by Scaliger and other great chronologists of his day. Fortunately, we are enabled to appeal from this supposed decisive authority to a still higher tribunal, viz. that of unerring astronomy, the most accurate test which can be brought to bear upon chronological computations. The test of a solar eclipse, the time of which may be computed now almost as accurately as it could have been registered when the event took place, and still more that of a total solar eclipse, which Mr. Airy declares to be at least ten times as valuable as any other eclipse of the sun for this purpose, when brought to bear upon the time of any event in history must necessarily outweigh any other evidence of date which can be given on the subject.

We have so frequently had occasion in pursuit of these inquiries* to refer to the total solar eclipse of the year B.C. 585, as that mentioned by Herodotus as having occurred during the battle between Cyaxares, king of Media, and Alyattes, king of Lydia, shortly before Nineveh was destroyed

* "Trans. Chron. Inst." vol. ii. part 3.

by the Medes and Babylonians, and the correctness of this date as attached to that event is now so seldom called in question, that it is unnecessary to enter into any detail here upon this point.* It is sufficient to observe that Herodotus places the fall of Nineveh not long after that eclipse, and that Abydenus, treating of Babylonian history, places the accession of Nebuchadnezzar to the throne immediately after the fall of Nineveh, all which well accords with the year B.C. 582, already pointed out as the date of the first year of his reign. So that the unquestionable accuracy of the date of the eclipse, the unusually precise record of Demetrius, the peculiar genealogical computation of St. Matthew, and the exact record of the age of Darius at the time when he began to reign over Babylon, all combine together in the most remarkable manner to lead us to the date B.C. 592 as the first year of Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon.

Now it is interesting to find that this is the very date to be derived from the reckoning of the ancient Chaldean historian, Berosus, who wrote four hun-

* We regret to find that Professor Rawlinson, in his "Anc. Monarchies," vol. iii. p. 210, seeks to accommodate this eclipse to his chronology, not his chronology to the eclipse. He sets aside the remarkable words, "day was *suddenly* turned into night," (*ἡμέρα ἐγένετο*) which is the peculiar feature of a total eclipse, and thus leaves himself at liberty to apply any partial eclipse of the sun to the event. And as one error leads to another, he feels himself compelled to expunge the name of king Deioces from Median history, because his revolt from Assyria is thus pushed up into the reign of the powerful Sargon, instead of falling in the reign of Sennacherib, in which, as Josephus informs us, it took place.

dred years before the compilation of Ptolemy's Canon : while the system of Babylonian dates, in and after the reign of Nebuchadnezzar, introduced by this latter document, which was wholly unknown either to Africanus or to Eusebius, or to the very learned Clement of Alexandria, has been the unfortunate means of obscuring the true Babylonian reckoning, even till the present day. For Eusebius, with all the most ancient authorities before him, very plainly states that the king called Sardanapalus by the Greeks was the last of all the Assyrian kings :* while Polyhistor, who copied from Berosus, tells us that Sardanapalus was no other than Nabopalassar, the father of Nebuchadnezzar : from which identification we are enabled to fix with exactness the date of the reign of the last of the Assyrian kings. Abydenus, who also copied from Berosus, fixes with accuracy the date of the termination of the Assyrian empire under Sardanapalus just

* Professor Rawlinson here throws off all respect for authority. He makes Saracus, the last king of Nineveh, fall in the ninth year of the reign of Cyaxares, when that king was about forty years of age, whereas Abydenus tells us that the marriage of the grand-daughter of Cyaxares had already taken place before the fall of Saracus. Herodotus gives twenty-eight years to the Scythian occupation of Asia, all in the reign of Cyaxares, Mr. Rawlinson finds not more than eight years according to his chronology. Abydenus tells us that the Assyrian empire ceased in B.C. 610, Mr. Rawlinson in B.C. 625. The Parian Chronicle, confirmed indirectly by an Assyrian inscription, which lowers the common date of the reign of Gyges, places the first year of Alyattes, who fought with Cyaxares, in B.C. 605, Mr. R. places his sixth year before B.C. 610.

167 years (erroneously written 67 in our copies of Eusebius*) after the first Olympiad, that is, in B.C. 610, and thus incidentally identifies that king with Nabopalassar: for Nabopalassar certainly began to reign in the year B.C. 625,—when the thrones of Babylon and Nineveh were still united,—as certified by a lunar eclipse in his fifth year, computed by Ptolemy. This last king of Assyria is called, in the book of Judith, “Nabuchodonosor, who reigned at Nineveh.” We read that in his twelfth year, that is in B.C. 614, he slew Arphaxad, or Phraortes, the king of Media, an event also recorded by Herodotus.† Four years later, that is in B.C. 610, Herodotus tells us that the Scythians (probably called in for the purpose) relieved him from the vengeance of Cyaxares, son of Phraortes, and that, having conquered the Medes, the Scythians from thenceforth became the arbiters of all Asia. Thus the empire of the Assyrians was virtually superseded by that of the Scythians, in B.C. 610, though Nineveh was not yet destroyed. Nabopolassar, however, or Nabuchodonosor, still lingered on the throne of Nineveh, by support of the Scythians, and in his eighteenth year, that is B.C. 608, “there was talk in the house of the king of the Assyrians that he should, as he said, avenge himself on all the earth.” A great army therefore of Scythians, Medes, and Persians, commanded by Holophernes, was poured into Syria, and marched even as far as Ashdod, with a view to the conquest of Egypt, at

* Eus. Auch. Part i. p. 39.

† Herod. i. 102.

which place it was stopped by Psammetichus, the Egyptian king who purchased peace, as related by Herodotus,* and also by the book of Judith.† Nothing can be more consistent and accurate than all this history thus put together. But now again Abydenus, still copying from Berosus, takes up the narrative, and informs us that another king,‡ styled "Saracus," a king we must assume set up by the Scythians, followed Sardanapalus on the throne of Nineveh, and ended his reign by burning himself in his palace when that city was finally besieged and destroyed by the Babylonians and Medes. Abydenus does not indeed state the length of the reign of Saracus, but we have the very best reason for believing that this siege took place twenty-eight or twenty-six years after the coming of the Scythians into Asia. Herodotus, in three places, marks the interval as twenty-eight years, which, counted from the year B.C. 610, brings us to the year B.C. 582; and Abydenus concludes his account of the siege by stating that Nebuchadnezzar, on the fall of Nineveh, took the throne of Babylon, and surrounded the city with a strong wall.§ The difference between the 1280 years counted by Castor and Abydenus from Ninus to the termination of the empire, and the 1306 years of Ctesias, counted from the same point to the taking of Nineveh by the Medes and Babylonians, is, however, only twenty-six years. These twenty-six years, therefore, end in B.C. 584,

* Herod. i. 105.

† Judith, ii. 28; iii. 1.

‡ Castor calls him Ninus.

§ Euseb. Auch. Part i. p. 25.

when we may suppose that the final siege by Nebuchadnezzar and Cyaxares began.

All the earliest records, therefore, combine to fix the date of the first year of Nebuchadnezzar to the year B.C. 582: and those critics, we think, are in error, who in interpretation of the ninth chapter of Daniel, propose to count sixty-two weeks of years, or 434 years, from B.C. 608, as the beginning of the reign of Nebuchadnezzar to the death of Onias, the high-priest, in B.C. 174. Such a reckoning indeed suited the ideas of the Jewish interpreter who paraphrased the tenth and twelfth chapters of Daniel in the days of the Maccabees, and who, by two verses of comment, as we have seen, (ch. x. 1, and ch. xi. 1), succeeded in raising the first year of Darius the Mede in Babylon from the year B.C. 492 to B.C. 538, thereby raising also the reign of Nebuchadnezzar. But this arrangement, we submit, is the result of a chronology made to suit his own interpretation, and by it both sceptical and believing critics have ever since been led astray.

Again, we test the accuracy of our Biblical reckoning by counting upwards from the first year of Nebuchadnezzar, B.C. 582, that is, from the fourth year of Jehoiakim (Jerem. xxv. 1.), to the fourteenth year of Hezekiah, thus:—

	Years.
JEHOIAKIM . . .	3
JOSIAH . . .	31
AMON . . .	2
MANASSEH . . .	55
HEZEKIAH . . .	15

106 + B.C. 582 = B.C. 688

and we are thus led to the year B.C. 588 for the close of the fourteenth year of Hezekiah. Now, this is the exact reckoning which was preserved amongst the Jews, when Demetrius wrote ; for he places the time of the carrying away of captives from Judea by Sennacherib, who threatened Jerusalem in Hezekiah's fourteenth year, with great precision, just four hundred and sixty-six years and nine months before the reign of the fourth Ptolemy,* that is, in the month of February, B.C. 688. From which we learn that the fourteenth of Hezekiah was concurrent with the two years B.C. 689 and 688, counting from Nisan to Nisan. This direct historical testimony we look upon as of extreme value.

But Holy Scripture has, we believe, preserved for our guidance a testimony even still more valuable; one indeed which appears to bring the reckoning of the reign of Hezekiah into a position of absolute precision, by a sign of a most remarkable character. This sign was foretold, in the first place, for the confirmation of the drooping faith of King Hezekiah, when heathen blasphemers threatened to raise their standard against the holy city; but it was recorded, we submit, with a fuller and a deeper purpose for the instruction of after ages, and specially, perhaps, with a view to cheer the wavering faith of the Church in these days of doubt and scepticism, when again blasphemers have assailed the city of God. For shortly before the invasion of Sennacherib,—say in the beginning of

* Trans. Chron. Inst. vol. ii. part iv. p. 102.

B.C. 689, according to our reckoning, we read that Hezekiah was sick unto death, and that in answer to his fervent prayer for recovery the Prophet Isaiah was sent to him to declare: "Thus saith the Lord the God of David thy Father, I have heard thy prayer—I have seen thy tears: behold, I will add unto thy days fifteen years, and I will defend this city," &c.* "And this shall be a sign unto you, Behold, I will bring again the shadow of the steps, which it shall have gone down on the steps (Maaloth) of Ahaz with the sun, ten steps backwards," or from the end. In these few words we appear to have brought before us a description of an instrument in the palace of Hezekiah, in use from the days of Ahaz, probably for marking the variation of the shadow cast by the sun from day to day. The words "shadow of the steps" going "*down upon the steps*," are most expressive; and we learn from them that—

1st. The steps of Ahaz were turned away from the sun.

For in that position only could they cast a shadow, the motion of which would be not horizontal, but up and down the steps, following the motion of the sun. Now, the only conceivable use of a fixed instrument so placed would be to observe the rise and fall of the shadow from day to day, as the sun on the meridian gradually rose and fell between summer and winter, while passing from solstice to solstice. It is quite clear

* Isa. xxxviii. 5, 6.

that no motion of the sun in its ordinary diurnal progress through the heavens would produce the effect described : and equally clear that the shadow cast by a gnomon placed at the head of such an erection of steps would, if placed, as such an instrument ought to be, at an angle equal to the latitude of the place, say $31^{\circ} 47'$ for Jerusalem, travel upwards and downwards upon the steps, "with the sun," from winter to summer and summer to winter, marking meridian altitudes from day to day, We assume then that—

2nd. The steps of Ahaz were set at an angle of not more than $31^{\circ} 47'$, sloping upwards towards the sun, in the plane of the meridian.

3rd. That a gnomon equal to about $2^{\circ} 54' 13''$ was placed at the head of the steps, causing the shadow on the shortest day of the year to fall beyond the lowest step. The sun's altitude on that day being $34^{\circ} 41' 13''$.

Such an instrument would indeed have been of the nature of what was called by Greek astronomers a Sciotheron, or shadow-taker, or Heliotropion, that is, an instrument formed to mark the turning of the sun at the tropics, then much required for correct regulation of the seasons of the year, and of special service to the Jews, whose festivals were fixed in connexion with the seasons. Some such instruments must of necessity have been of early invention, and probably may have been known in the time of Homer. For we find a passage in the Odyssey, speaking of the "turn-

ings of the sun," *τροπαὶ ἡλίου*, as to be found in what he describes as "an island called Syria."* While Diogenes Laertius, in his life of Pherecydes, clearly refers to this same instrument, whether natural or artificial, when he speaks of the Heliotropion preserved in the island of Syra. The Scholiast on this passage in Homer writes—"There, they say, was the cave of the sun, by means of which the turnings of the sun were exhibited;" that is, probably by means of a ray of light admitted through an aperture into the cave. Anaximander, according to Laertius, was the first Greek who discovered the use of Gnomons, and placed them on the Sciotherons of Lacedæmon, for the purpose of indicating the tropics and equinoxes.†

The obelisk was the simplest, though most imperfect form of Heliotropion, marking indistinctly the length of the shadow in summer and winter. In Italy another simple form of Heliotropion may yet be seen in several churches. In Milan Cathedral a meridian line is marked on the pavement, upon which an image of the sun, cast through an aperture in the southern wall, travels backwards and forwards from winter to summer, and summer to winter. In Bologna a similar arrangement was made in the church of St. Petronia, in A.D. 1576, and another by Dominicho Cassini in A.D. 1645. Again a similar sort of instrument was to be seen

* *Odyss.* l. xv. 402.

† See a valuable dissertation by Salmasius, on Sciotherons and Heliotropions, *Plin. Exerc.* p. 447.

in the observatory at Peking, when visited by Du Halde. "They had contrived (says P. Le Comte) a gnomon in a low room." . . . "The slit which the ray of the sun came through is about eight feet above the floor, is horizontal, and formed by two pieces of copper borne up in the air, which, by turning, may be set nearer or farther from each other, to enlarge or contract the aperture. Lower is a table with a brass plate in the middle, on which was drawn a meridian line fifteen feet long, divided by transverse lines, which were neither finished nor very exact. There are some small channels round the table, for holding water so as to level it."*

Now it is obvious in all these instances that if a flight of steps were placed on the meridian line, sloping upwards from the lowest step to within a few feet below the aperture, the ray or image of the sun would travel up and down such steps from solstice to solstice. Such then would appear to have been the form of the Heliotropion of Ahaz.

Now on the day of the recovery of Hezekiah, an extraordinary motion of the shadow was observed on these steps of Ahaz, by the rising of the shadow ten steps from the point to which it had "gone down with the sun." This effect, it will be observed, is spoken of as a sign, not as a miracle. A sign, as we have suggested, not noted merely with reference to this king's doubting faith, but

* Du Halde's "China," fol. 1741, vol. ii. p. 131.

recorded also with a prescient view to the incredulity of later days. Let it be remembered that the cure of Hezekiah was effected not by miracle, but by the ordinary application of a lump of figs. The promise of his recovery was confirmed by the motion of a shadow on the dial of the palace. We are justified, therefore in looking for some natural phenomenon by which to account for this peculiar motion upon the dial; and the obvious, if not only, way in nature in which the sun's shadow could with a regular and steady motion be deflected downwards on such an instrument would be by the slow passing of the moon over the upper part of the sun's disk as it approached the meridian.* We inquire then of astronomers whether any such phenomenon occurred visible at Jerusalem at the beginning of the year B.C. 689. And we learn that a large partial eclipse upon the upper limb of the sun, was visible at Jerusalem, on the 11th January, B.C. 689, somewhere about half-past eleven o'clock on that day.

This eclipse, then, fulfils four of the main conditions required by the narrative to make it applicable to our theory and chronological reckoning. 1st. It occurred in the historical year of the

* Dean Milman thinks the effect may have been produced "by a cloud refracting the light."—*History of the Jews*, vol. i. p. 385. A dark cloud no doubt might produce the effect of deflecting the shadow. But the cause in such case would have been so manifest to every one, and the effect so transient, that the phenomenon could hardly have been referred to afterwards as "a wonder that was done in the land." 2 Chron. xxxii. 31.

king's illness. 2nd. It occurred while the sun was approaching towards, and passing over the meridian. 3rd. The obscuration was on the upper portion of the sun's disk, causing the point of light to be deflected downwards. 4th. It was visible at Jerusalem. But there is a fifth condition of the most stringent character, by the fulfilment or non-fulfilment of which, in combination with the other four, we may determine with moral certainty whether this eclipse was, or was not, the actual cause of the phenomenon observed by Hezekiah, viz. that the deflection of light during the eclipse should be capable of affecting the shadow on such an instrument as we have described to the extent implied by the words, "ten steps;" and also that the month of January, when the eclipse occurred, should be a month suitable for the development of such a phenomenon.

Now the passage of the moon over the face of the sun during this eclipse occupied about two hours and a half. But from the time of central conjunction when the obscuration was the greatest, and the point of light depressed to the lowest, to the time when the light of the upper portion of the sun's disk was released by the passing on of the moon eastward, was just about twenty minutes: and this, therefore, was the time during which the phenomenon of retrogression was exhibited under the eyes of the king. Assuming, then, that the time when the ascending shadow had travelled upwards to the tenth step coincided, or nearly so,


with the time when the sun had reached its highest altitude for the day, at noon, we infer,—

4th. That the time of central conjunction during this eclipse was not later than from twenty to fifteen minutes before noon.*

It could not have been much earlier, because the phenomenon of the resting of the shadow for a time at its *apparently* highest point for the day, which preceded the promise that it should rise ten steps, has also to be accounted for; and this cessation of its motion upwards could not have taken place till about twenty-five minutes before noon, when the decreasing motion of the sun in declination, or slackening motion upwards as it approached mid-day, would have become counteracted by the coming on of the eclipse. Now, at twenty-five minutes before twelve, the sun's disk would have risen to the altitude of $35^{\circ} 8' 13''$; and the highest visible point of light would, owing to the eclipse, then have been about $35^{\circ} 4' 13''$; and at twenty minutes before twelve, or at the time of greatest obscuration, the extreme cusps of light produced by the intervention of the moon would still have stood at about the same altitude, or at $35^{\circ} 4'$, just $23'$ of a degree below the highest point of light at noon, as shown on the accompanying diagram.

* The exact time of conjunction cannot at present be determined with exactness by astronomers. When this our reckoning, however, shall have been established, the retrogradation of the shadow in B.C. 689 may become the means of rectifying the lunar theory, both as regards time of conjunction, and also as to the number of digits eclipsed.

SUN'S ALTITUDE BEFORE AND AT NOON.




SOLAR ECLIPSE AT JERUSALEM, 11TH JANUARY, B.C. 689.

The whole disk was now just raised above the gnomon, yet no motion upwards of the shadow had been observed for full five minutes. The time shown by the dial apparently was mid-day.

Now the question is, to what extent would a staircase rising at an angle of $31^{\circ} 47'$ towards the sun, with a gnomon so placed at the top as to cast the shadow on the shortest day of the year to the foot of the lowest step, be affected by a movement perpendicularly of the point of light to the extent of $23'$ of a degree. The effect, we know, would be widely different at different periods of the year.

In the summer, when the sun is high in the heavens, the shadow short, and falling from the gnomon upon the upper steps of the instrument, the effect would be hardly perceptible; in the spring or autumn the effect would be small, but somewhat greater; but in the winter, when the sun is low, the shadow long, and falling upon the lower steps, the effect would be the greatest, and on the 11th of January, B.C. 689, would have been to the extent of neither more nor less than one-twelfth of the whole range of steps.* This extent of motion then, coupled with the winter season of the year, is fully sufficient to satisfy the fifth condition required by the narrative. And whether the erection of steps was on a scale similar (though reversed in position)

* Dean Stanley refers to an eclipse which occurred in Sept. B.C. 713, as that which Thenius supposed to have been the one which affected the dial. But the motion of the shadow would, as he says, have been almost imperceptible at that time of the year.—“*Lectures on the Jewish Church*,” 2nd Series, p. 486.




ANCIENT SUN-DIAL AT THE BRAMIN'S OBSERVATORY, BENARES.
 From drawings by Lieut.-Col. Archibald Campbell, formerly Chief Engineer in the East India Company's Service.
 "Philos. Trans." vol. lxvii.

to the huge dials still visible in the ruined observatories at Delhi and Benares, the stair of one of which is one hundred and eighteen feet in length,* or whether it was, as we are satisfied, an instrument adapted to the interior of a chamber, if its length was divided into one hundred and twenty parts, the movement of the shadow to the extent of one-twelfth of the length would have affected it to the exact degree of "ten steps." Neither a day or two earlier nor later, could the same degree of motion have been produced. In no year probably before or after B.C. 689 has the same combination of circumstances concurred. There is perhaps an additional reason for supposing that this fall and rise of the shadow was in winter ? For the time of year appears to be pointed out by the word "endwards," or "from the end," (אַחֲרֵיכִי)† that is, from the *lower* end

* See "Asiatic Researches of Calcutta," vol. v. p. 177.

† The Hebrew word which we have translated "from the end," may also be translated "hindwards," or "from the back part." Such a translation, if the phenomenon was witnessed in the open court, as some suppose, would suggest the idea that the "steps of Ahaz" may have been a double instrument sloping both *backwards* and forwards, north and south, to and from the sun, at the angle of the latitude of Jerusalem, $31^{\circ} 47'$. The slope towards the north would thus, as in every correctly formed dial, have been parallel with the axis, or *poles* of the earth, and the motion of the shadow from that slope would have marked the hours before and after noon. The slope towards the south, or hindwards, in the form of steps would, by means of a *gnomon*, as explained, have marked by the meridian shadow the day of the year, and the turning of the sun at the solstices. Such an instrument appears to be referred to by Herodotus, when he speaks of the *pole*, and *gnomon*, and the *twelve parts of the day* having been derived from the Babylonians. Herod. ii. 109.



"SO THE SUN RETURNED TEN STEPS, BY WHICH STEPS IT WAS GONE DOWN."

of the steps towards which the shadow had gone down. Now the lower end of the steps could only have been the place of the shadow in January or December, at the time of the winter solstice. The eclipse, therefore, on the 11th of January, near the time of noon-day, and in the year B.C. 689, so exactly falls in with all the conditions required by the history, that we cannot doubt that the 14th, or rather the end of the 13th year of Hezekiah fell in the beginning of that year, and that the day of the king's recovery from sickness was the 11th day of January.


How vividly is the scene in Hezekiah's palace on that day presented before our eyes. We assume with certainty that the sick and dying king was incapable of movement and closely confined to his chamber, and that all which is described as passing between him and the prophet, and all that was witnessed on the dial, could only have taken place within the walls of that chamber. We see him stretched upon his couch with his face turned despondingly "towards the wall." The hangings of the entrance are closed, for it is winter, and the darkness of the chamber, which is in an inner court of the winter-house,* is broken only by the flickering flame upon the hearth.† An ornamental structure of

* Jer. xxxvi. 20-22.

† The dial chamber of the palace was doubtless placed in the winter-house, for it was at the winter solstice chiefly that this instrument would have been of use. The chamber must have been capable of being darkened, for the light on the lower steps for twenty days about the solstice was only that of the penumbra,

polished marble in the form of steps dimly appears projecting in front of the wall to which he turns, reaching some thirty feet upwards from the floor at the north end towards the ceiling at the south end of the apartment. A broad beam of light is seen shining down through an aperture from above, such as we have imagined in the cave at Syra, or which might be daily seen at Pekin or at Milan. It is the rays of the penumbra issuing from the sun, whose disk is just beginning to rise above the gnomon, some five-and-thirty minutes before mid-day. It illumines the lower steps of the instrument, while all the steps above are left in shade. The light falls near to where the couch of the king is placed, and around which in grief are standing his family, his attendants, and his faithful minister, the prophet. He watches the slow progress of the shadow upwards, telling him that the day has nearly reached its middle course—the day, alas! which possibly may prove to be his last—and his thoughts turn mournfully to days gone by in which he has “walked before his God in truth, and served Him with a perfect heart.” He seems to call in question the justice of the sentence pronounced against him, and complains aloud that his days are cut off, that he is going “to the gates of the grave,” and is “deprived of the residue of his years.” The progress of the shadow gradually slackens. It has already ceased

and the motion of the shadow then could only have been well observed in a dark place.



VARIATION OF THE POINT OF LIGHT FOR EVERY FIVE MINUTES BEFORE AND AFTER
CENTRAL CONJUNCTION.

to rise upon the steps. The hour of noonday apparently has arrived. That hour for marking which alone the instrument is formed. The prophet softly leaves the chamber, and is about to quit the palace, when, "before he had reached the middle court," he is commanded to return.* Quickly re-entering the chamber, he announces the promise of the king's recovery, and that on the third day he shall go up into the house of the Lord. "What shall be the sign," is the reply, "that the Lord will heal me, and that I shall go up, &c.?" The prophet points to the shadow on the dial, which now for several minutes had been resting on a step full ten degrees below its proper altitude for the day. Like the days of Hezekiah, its progress upwards was cut off, and both had prematurely reached the zenith of their course. As compared with its position on the previous day at noon, the shadow had gone down. He predicts its movement upwards. And the words have scarcely left his lips when, to the amaze of the king and his attendants, it is seen gradually to ascend during the space of twenty minutes, till it has reached its highest altitude for the day. It is enough. "He hath both spoken to me," he cries, "and He hath done it. I shall go softly all my days in the bitterness of my soul." How impressive, how appropriate is this sign that he shall "go up" into the House of the Lord. That he shall ascend the steps of the temple, chanting the solemn "songs

* 2 Kings, xx. 4.

of the steps," and praising and magnifying "the Lord of Lords, whose mercy endureth for ever."

The fame of this two-fold manifestation of the mid-day shadow and its predicted rise of ten degrees quickly spreads throughout the palace and the city. It is spoken of as a miracle. It reaches the invading army of the Babylonians. It is repeated on their return to the astrologers of Babylon. And the princes of Babylon send ambassadors to Hezekiah "to inquire of the wonder that was done in the land."*

But to return to the subject of the prophecy of the seventy weeks. Having thus defined with exactness the strict limits of the whole period of 490 years, as falling between the Sabbatical years, B.C. 3-2, and B.C. 493-2, and *that* in accordance with the first eleven propositions laid down for the interpretation of the prophecy in pages 56, 57, and 58; it now remains to point out, in rectification of the common mode of arrangement, how the several minor periods of "one week," "seven weeks," and "threescore and two weeks," comprised within, and making together, "seventy weeks," are to be accounted for in history, in conformity with proposition 15, viz. that the "one week" must necessarily precede the "seven."

The first period then to be accounted for is that of "one week," or seven years, counted from the completion of the seventy years' desolation of Jerusalem and commencement of the desolations of

* 2 Chron. xxxii. 31.

Babylon, say in the autumn of the Sabbatical year B.C. 493-2, not long before the assumption by Darius of the government of that city; and seven full years, reckoned from that time, would end in autumn of the Sabbatical year beginning in autumn B.C. 486. Now the end of this period of seven years must also form the beginning of the following period of forty-nine years, or "seven weeks," which is declared to count "from the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem." We have, therefore, to look for no other event than the building and restoration of "the holy city," as the point of division between these two first periods of the prophecy.

Now within these first seven years we read in the book of Haggai* that on the 24th day of the month Sebat, that is in December, in the 2nd year of Darius, B.C. 491, the foundations of the Temple of Jerusalem were laid by Zerubbabel, and that in the month Adar, *in the sixth year of Darius*,† that is, in March B.C. 486, in the sixth year counted from the spring of the Sabbatical year, B.C. 492, the building was completed, "according to *the commandment of the God of Israel*, and the commandment of Cyrus, and Darius, and Artach-Shashtha king of Persia." The dedication, by which event Jerusalem became once again the "holy city" of God, took place probably in the autumn of this year.‡ This command from heaven, then, is the

* Haggai, ii. 18.

† Ezra, vi. 14.

‡ Josephus says the temple was completed in seven years.

"commandment" spoken of by Daniel, from the going forth of which to the time of Messiah should be "seven weeks and threescore and two weeks," that is, 483 years. The emphasis with which it is marked as the commandment of God, and the completion of the commandment of Cyrus, which also had proceeded from the Lord God of heaven,* is sufficiently remarkable to satisfy those who dwell upon the word, *davar*,† as implying a command from God. But it is still more remarkable, that the time when this commandment was carried into effect is unmistakably fixed to some year in which Darius and Artach-Shashtha were reigning together on the Persian throne. We beg the reader's attention to the fifth and sixth chapters of the book of Ezra, in which the contest concerning the rebuilding of the temple between the Samaritans and the Jews is narrated. It will be observed particularly that Darius, that is, the son of Hystaspes, was then appealed to to search in "the treasure house which is *there* at Bābylon," v. 17, whether any decree had ever been issued by Cyrus, for the rebuilding of the temple at Jerusalem, which seems to imply that the king was then present in that city. It also appears that now, for the first time, Darius is styled "king of Assyria," vi. 22, as if he had but lately taken the government over the realm of the Chaldeans: while Artach-Shashtha, *at the same time*, is spoken of as reigning

* Ezra, i. 2.

† See "Dr. Williams' Introduction to Mr. Desprez," p. lxi.

king of Persia, vi. 14. Now it was in this very year, B.C. 486, in the fourth year after the battle of Marathon, that Darius, we are told, felt himself called upon to appoint his successor, who also from that time was his coadjutor seated with him on the throne. Herodotus relates that after a contest between Xerxes and his brother, Xerxes was declared to be the king's successor, and, as Plutarch relates, was led by his brother to the throne. It is clear, then, beyond doubt that this Artach-Shashtha of Ezra is the Xerxes of Herodotus : and those who think otherwise are bound to explain in what other way this combination of two Persian kings on the same throne in the reign of Darius is to be accounted for. This, we know, was the opinion of the LXX translator of Daniel, who, however faulty in his paraphrase in other respects, has, in translating ch. v. 31, preserved, we believe, the true interpretation of this passage. For he writes, "Artaxerxes of the Medes received the kingdom, and Darius full of days, and venerable with old age." He clearly refers to the elevation of Xerxes to the throne of Persia in the old age of Darius, and thus shows that the Jews of Alexandria had not generally at that time adopted the false idea first introduced by Josephus, that "Darius the Mede" reigned at Babylon before the first year of Cyrus. Like Ezra, he calls the associated king Artaxerxes, and thus we have good reason to believe that Xerxes, who "in the *beginning* of his reign" (that is, of his government) received an ac-

cusation against the Jews under the title Ahasuerus,* either at this time, or at some period before Ezra wrote, had assumed the loftier title "Arta-Xerxes." This change of title, we think, affords the true solution of a difficulty in Thucydides, where he speaks of the flight of Themistocles to the court of Artaxerxes, though we know that the flight took place in B.C. 474, in the reign of Xerxes. Josephus also affirms that Ezra, who received his commission from Artaxerxes, came up to Jerusalem in the reign of Xerxes: while the tradition of the Rabbis is, that Ezra came to Jerusalem in the seventh year of the new temple, that is, according to our reckoning, in the reign of Xerxes. A more complete explanation of the first seven years, or "one week" of the prophetic period, we submit, can hardly be desired.

And here, again, it is satisfactory to find upon examination that this reckoning, and, indeed, this whole interpretation, is the result of no newly-invented theory, but that it is the same as that which was entertained in the East in the early periods of the Church. For Abulpharagius, surnamed Bar-Hebræus, tells us that about the year A.D. 1300, he visited the province of Azerbijan, in Armenia, and searched the archives of the city Margan, where he extracted many things from Syriac, Saracenic, and Persian books, which he considered worthy to be preserved from loss; and after briefly narrating the history of the world from Adam to the

* Ezra, iv. 6.

birth of Christ he writes,* "In the days of Herod our Redeemer was born ; and the seven together with the sixty-and-two weeks of Daniel, which together make 483 years, were completed, in combination from the sixth year of Darius son of Hystaspes." Now, 483 years added to the year of the birth of Christ, bring us to the year B.C. 486. Again, he writes,† "There are collected from the time of the building of the temple in the first of Solomon, even to this year in which the second building was finished, 508 years ;" which leads us up to the year B.C. 993 for the first year of Solomon, which is the year we have long ago determined from Demetrius and other sources to be that in which Solomon came to the throne.‡

We now proceed to reckon the next period of "seven weeks," or forty-nine years, which is to be counted "from the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem." Here the particular features of the period seem to be pointed out by the words, "*the street shall be built, and the wall, in troublous times.*" The limits of the forty-nine years thus appear to be exactly defined.

* "Tempore hujus Herodis natus est redemptor noster, finitæque sunt hebdomades septem una cum hebdomadibus 62 Danielis, quæ conficiunt annos 483, consolidandos ab anno sexto Darii Hystaspis." P. 46.

† "Anno ejus (Darii fil. Hystaspis) sexto perfectum est templum, in mense Ijar, altum 60 cubitorum, latum viginti. Colliguntur anni a condito templo primo Salomonis usque ad hunc annum, quo structura altera finita est, 508." Vol. i. p. 31.

‡ See Chronological Table in the Appendix.

The command from the God of Israel to restore the "holy city" marks the beginning: the building of "the wall" of the holy city marks the end. These forty-nine years, therefore, must be counted from the dedication of the temple in the autumn of the year B.C. 486, and end in autumn of the year B.C. 436, which date again marks the close of a sabbatical year. Now what does Josephus say concerning the building of the wall of Jerusalem by Nehemiah? After relating that the work was at length completed amidst great opposition from the surrounding people, and how the workmen were compelled to work with arms in their hands, as the prophet had foretold in "troublous times," he concludes thus: "This trouble he (Nehemiah) underwent for two years and four months, for in so long a time was the wall built, in the twenty-eighth year of the reign of Xerxes (Artaxerxes), in the ninth month,"* that is, in December, 436.

The text of Josephus' copy of Nehemiah appears to have differed here from the text of our present copies of that book. He clearly reads the "fifty and two days," of Ch. vi. 15, as fifty and two months, or two years and four months, a much more reasonable time for the completion of so great a work, than the same number of days. He also places the coming of Nehemiah to Jerusalem in the 25th, not in the 20th year of Artaxerxes, as in our copies. The result is a fulfilment of the period of "seven

* Jos. Ant. xi: 5, 8.

weeks," as exact as that of the "seventy weeks," and of the "one week."

But we have observed that this period of forty-nine years is the precise length of the period of a Jubilee, and we look therefore for some event as marking the presence at this time of that peculiar year, and we find that it is appropriately marked by the consecration of the wall of Jerusalem in the beginning of the fiftieth year. For, as in our own days it is the custom from time to time, for municipal purposes, to walk the boundaries of our parishes, so in the days after the captivity, it was the custom to consecrate the boundaries of walled cities, because the law affecting property within and without the walls, was different as regarded re-entry in the year of Jubilee.* The registration of genealogies is also said to have been the work of the year of Jubilee,† and this we know was undertaken by Nehemiah in the year of the dedication of the wall.‡

There is something very remarkable in this division of 483 years, or sixty-nine weeks, into two periods of "seven," and "threescore and two weeks." The primary purpose was, as we have seen, to mark the time of the completion of the wall. But this express mention of "seven weeks" at the beginning of the combined period seems also to imply that a new era or computation of Jubilees, which

* Lev. xxv. 29-30. "Seder Olam Rabba," ch. xxx.

† Smith's "Dictionary of the Bible," vol. i. p. 1153.

‡ Nehem. xii. 27.

had been suspended during the captivity, was now commanded to be reckoned, as in the days of Solomon from the building of the "holy city," so now again from the time of the restoration of the "holy city," commencing, as every new era must, with a period of Jubilee. Ten Jubilee periods of 49 years each, or 490 years, had, as we have seen, been accomplished in the year B.C. 492, and from thence a new period of seventy Sabbaths, or 490 years, was to be computed to Messiah. But the era of the Jubilee in connexion with the Sabbatical years was now to be broken, and not to be computed from B.C. 492, but from a point seven years later, that is, from B.C. 486. The command seems to have been so understood by Ezra. For such is the Jewish tradition as related by Maimonides,* who says that the old computation was put an end to during the captivity, and that Ezra constituted, not the seventh, but the *thirteenth* year of the second temple the first sabbath, that is, the thirteenth year after the year B.C. 492, and the seventh year after the restoration of the holy city in B.C. 486. It is in the years of this new era, we think, that some of the numerical periods in Daniel connected with the future destinies of the holy people are specially to be reckoned.

The remaining period of "threescore and two weeks," or 434 years, "unto Messiah the Prince," requires no explanation. It was exactly completed

* Maimon. de Shemitta et Jubileo.

between the autumn of B.C. 436, and the autumn of B.C. 3, about which time Christ was born, at the beginning of the Sabbatical year. This last date is again securely fixed by the record of a lunar eclipse at Jerusalem on the night of the 10th January, B.C. 1, not two months before the death of Herod the Great, marking that the child Jesus must then have been in the second year of his age, which agrees with our reckoning.

All that is predicted as about to happen "after threescore and two weeks," viz.—the cutting off of Messiah, the coming of a prince to destroy the city and the sanctuary, and the taking away of the daily sacrifice, which events took place in the reign of Titus, we consider to have no reference whatever to the period of Seventy Weeks.

Such, then, we maintain, is the correct reckoning of the chronology of the Hebrew commonwealth, both before and after the captivity. Such is the plain and obvious reading of the words of the seventy weeks' prophecy. And such is its precise and literal fulfilment in the birth of Jesus. Divine prescience alone could have foreseen the great event. By Divine wisdom alone could it have been ordained and foretold. Assuming, then, the correctness of our reckoning, we ask, How can any one venture to maintain, in the face of such a fulfilment, that prophecy, or the accurate announcement of the times of future events connected with the welfare of His creatures, is beneath the purpose and inconsistent with the ways of God towards men? How

can any one feel justified in denying the inspiration of the holy Daniel thus selected to convey this wondrous message to his people? And inasmuch as this foreknowledge and distinctness of announcement are far removed above the reach or effort of human intellect, must not all confess that they partake in measure of the nature of the miraculous? Lastly, we would appeal to our Jewish brethren, and ask what need is there, what room is there left for denying this the most wonderful event of their most wonderful history? What difficulty lies in the way of their confession, that this Offspring of the root of Jesse, born at the appointed time, and in the appointed place, by whom, as they and all the world have seen, the destinies of mankind have been more deeply influenced than by any son of Adam till this day, can be any but their own expected Saviour, "Messiah, the Prince?" The "Son of Man" pre-eminently, as the perfect type and pattern of humanity, born of a woman, and set for an example to mankind; and yet most truly also "the only begotten Son of God," inasmuch as He was made incapable of sin, and in Him alone of all mankind the Holy Spirit, love, and power of the Almighty deigned to dwell from His beginning. God manifest in the flesh. Yet not a second God. For He Himself has taught us that we also may become the sons of God, if, feeding on Him in our hearts, we will partake of the Holy Spirit, and so be one with Him as He is one with God, and yet not many Gods.

But it has been remarked by a late eminent writer,* speaking sneeringly of the numerical periods of the book of Daniel, "What has the Holy Spirit to do with counting years, and months, and days? In his kingdom, the only true and the only divine one, time and space are of a very subordinate importance, and wherever He has moved holy men in the Church to say something respecting times, it will be found that the subject of the prophecy is not to be wholly external and idealess, but connected with the great thoughts of God, and, finally, that it offers to the mind a certain latitude, and to individual will and action all their energy."

We accept the concluding sentiments of this passage as obviously true. The coming of the Saviour of the world at the precise termination of a predicted period of weeks of years was indeed connected with the great thoughts of God. But to say that the Holy Spirit deigns not to take note of time and space, and days and years, in connexion with the affairs of this lower world, is as obviously untrue. We cannot sotat her from our reading of Scripture, and especially of the Book of Daniel. Was it not commanded to the children of Israel to keep holy the seventh day? Was not the septennial division of years, and again the division into periods of fifties, an express ordinance of God? Not only have we before us, in the prophecy we have been considering, a signal instance of accurate computation of

* Bunsen's "Hippolitus," vol. ii. p. 286.

years by the Holy Spirit, reckoned in His own ordained calendar of sabbatic years and jubilees—of an express announcement to Daniel the beloved of the deep and gracious counsels of the Almighty towards his people through the medium of a messenger from above, and again, of the fulfilment of those counsels at the appointed time by the same heavenly messenger who appeared before the lowly Mary—but we also seem to arrive at an unlooked-for discovery from the examination of the numbers in this book, viz., that it has pleased the Almighty to forecast the destinies of His chosen people in fixed and measured cycles of this sacred calendar. For, as we have already seen, reckoning upwards from the birth of Christ to the release from captivity at Babylon is a period of exactly 490 years; from thence to the dedication of Solomon's temple is a similar period of 490 years; and again from thence, according to the reckoning of the Second Book of Kings, to the mission of Moses to the children of Israel in Egypt, there is a third period of exactly 490 years; so that it may be said, with a considerable degree of precision, that the children of Israel have fulfilled their bygone destinies in three equal cycles of

70 weeks of years under the Tabernacle :

70 weeks of years, including the 70 neglected Sabbaths kept at Babylon, under the first temple :

70 weeks of years under the second temple, even till the laying of the foundation-stone of the

third temple, not made with hands, in the birth of Jesus Christ.

“Oh, house of Israel, cannot I do with you as the potter, saith the Lord? Behold, as the clay is in the potter’s, so are ye in mine hands, oh house of Israel.”*

Now in the same degree that we are impressed with the conviction that these several periods have been literally fulfilled in the past history of God’s holy people, so shall we feel confident in the expectation that the several unfulfilled periods of the Book of Daniel, viz., the twice repeated period of “time, times, and a half,” or 1260 years, during which the holy people are to be given into the hands of the little horn of ch. vii.—the 2400 years,† until the expiration of which the “sanctuary and the host shall be trodden under foot,” ch. viii. 13, 14,—and the 1290, and 1335 years counted from the setting up of the abomination that maketh desolate, xii. 11,—shall be accomplished in the future history of this peculiar people.

Thus, then, we trust that we have succeeded in accomplishing the main object of the task we have undertaken, viz., of proving from the unmistakable accomplishment of two of the most remark-

* Jer. xviii. 6.

† This period of 2400, according to the Greek of Theodosion, instead of 2300, as in our ordinary Hebrew copies, is confirmed, as observed by Mr. Hatley Frere, by seven MSS. in Hebrew and Armenian, examined by the late Dr. Wolf, viz. two at Bokhara, one at Ispahan, one at Adrianople, one at Meschid, one at Ulshkelesia, one in Chaldæa.

able prophecies of the book of Daniel, the inspiration, and therefore also the genuineness, of that holy book. And thus incidentally we have disposed of the second and ninth chapters of the book. In the course of our observations, we have also given reason for believing that a portion of the tenth chapter, and the greater part of the eleventh, have not proceeded from the hand of Daniel, but from the hand of some zealous interpreter, endeavouring to apply the prophecies of Daniel to his own times, and we have nothing further to add concerning these two chapters.

The first, third, fourth, fifth, and sixth chapters of Daniel relate chiefly to historical events, and do not, therefore, come within the range of our remarks, which are limited to the question of the inspiration of the book. There remain, then, for consideration only three prophetic chapters, viz., the seventh, eighth, and twelfth, upon which we propose to make a very few observations; and we think it will appear, that the way to the interpretation of the prophecies contained in them has already been cleared and disencumbered of many difficulties.

To begin with ch. vii. We have seen how strongly the Jewish interpreter in the days of the Maccabees was impressed with the idea, that "the fourth kingdom upon earth," vii. 23, "dreadful and terrible," which we now so distinctly recognise in past history as the Roman empire, was no other than the empire of the successors of Alexander the Great,

the then last empire which had appeared in the world; that "the ten horns of this kingdom," v. 24, were represented by ten individual kings selected out of upwards of twenty who succeeded Alexander in Egypt and Syria; and that the "little horn" which "came up among them," v. 8, which had "eyes like the eyes of a man, and a mouth speaking great things," was no other than Antiochus Epiphanes, one of the ten. The obvious contradiction involved in this interpretation, and that which proves that it cannot have been dictated by the Holy Spirit, is, that if the ten horns are to be represented by ten of the successors of Alexander in Syria and Egypt, which is undoubtedly the writer's intention in chap. xi., the little horn from amongst them must also have arisen *in those same days*, and in that same country; whereas, on the contrary, it is clearly foretold by the Spirit that the power of this little horn shall last till "the ancient of days did sit," v. 9, 11, 26, and until "the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven shall be given to the saints of the Most High," which are events not yet come to pass; so that it is impossible that the portrait of the little horn should be intended to represent the king Antiochus. Mr. Desprez and Mr. Perowne,* therefore, consistently with the indications of chap. xi., but inconsistently with the latter facts, both argue that the little horn of the seventh chapter and the little horn of the eighth chapter

* See "Contemporary Review," vol. i. p. 104.

are one and the same, viz., Antiochus. While Dr. Pusey and those who with him look upon the little horn of chapter viii. as Antiochus, inconsistently with the contents of ch. xi., argue that the little horn of chap. vii. must represent some future Antichrist. Both these views are involved in irreconcilable contradiction. In the days of the Maccabees, the first of these interpretations involved indeed no insuperable difficulty: for who could say that the kingdom of the saints, or holy people, was not then to be established in the holy land never to be removed? We now, however, perceive from subsequent history that the idea of making the successors of Alexander represent the fourth kingdom, is manifestly impossible. Dismissing, then, from our minds the necessarily plain and prosaic comment of the Maccabean interpreter, who merely endeavoured to apply in the form of vision the actual current events of history to the words of Daniel, let us turn to the writings of a far more enlightened Jewish interpreter of this prophecy of a later date, to one whose spiritual and prophetic character is in remarkable affinity with that of Daniel,—we mean the inspired and beloved disciple St. John, who in treating of these same periods reaching yet into futurity, has guided our understanding of this chapter by the adoption of the same symbols with those of Daniel, and in his interpretation or expansion of these symbols has clothed his language with a dignity of style worthy of the sublimity of the original vision.

St. John, in ch. xiii. sees in vision this same

“little horn” of Daniel when he speaks of a beast with “seven heads and ten horns,” v. 1; and we are sure of the identity of the horn and the beast, because while the horn of Daniel has “a mouth speaking great things,” to the beast of St. John is given “a mouth speaking great things,” v. 5; while the horn of Daniel “wears out the saints of the Most High,” to the beast of St. John it is given “to make war with the saints and to overcome them,” v. 7; and while the saints are given into the hands of the little horn until “a time, times, and the dividing of time,” or 1260 days, to the beast that makes war with the saints it was given “to continue forty and two months,” or 1260 days. Now, St. John informs us, xvii. 7-12, that the seven heads of this beast “are seven mountains;” that the ten horns “are ten kings which have received no kingdom as yet;” and that these ten kings shall give their power and strength unto the beast. So that the beast, like the little horn, rises from amongst the ten. And now again upon the self-same hills we see the beast arrayed in scarlet, v. 3, with a woman also so arrayed, “drunk with the blood of the saints,” seated on him, and the plain interpretation is added, that this woman represents the city then reigning over the kings of the earth, v. 18, that is Rome. From this inspired interpreter, then, we learn that the ten horns of the fourth kingdom of Daniel were not even in existence in the days of Antiochus, and that the seat of the “little horn” from amongst them should be, not in Syria, but at Rome.

Again, with reference to this seventh chapter of Daniel, we read in St. John, chap. xiv. 14, "And I looked, and behold a white cloud, and upon the cloud one sat like unto the Son of man, having on his head a golden crown, and in his hand a sharp sickle," wherewith to reap the earth. Thus, as in Daniel, so in St. John, still the scene we find is laid in future time. And in chap. i. 7 : "Behold, he cometh with clouds ; and every eye shall see him, and they also which pierced him : and all the kindreds of the earth shall wail because of him."* So that the whole outline of this chapter of Daniel is appropriated and applied with extreme distinctness by St. John, to times which clearly have not yet come to pass. The Maccabean interpretation is at variance with St. John throughout. For a power rising in the east cannot be identified with one whose position is clearly fixed by St. John in the west. Nor can a power by whom the "daily sacrifice" was literally taken away, viz. Antiochus, be looked upon as even typical of a power in connexion with whom this peculiar act of impiety is nowhere spoken of. The little horn of ch. vii. is nowhere spoken of in that chapter as an impious king. He persecutes and overcomes the saints of the Most High, but he is not said to destroy. His words are spoken rather concerning than against the Most High.† The na-

* See the comment of J. Pye Smith, showing how this passage has reference to the future establishment of the Jewish Church under the New Testament. Vol. i. p. 289.

† vii. 25.

ture of his blasphemy hitherto is, not that he has rejected God, but that he has made his word equal to that of God : and yet, perhaps, deeper and more distinct blasphemy may, in the nature of things, be expected from him as the time of his destruction approaches.*

With regard to the period of "time, times, and a half"—the only period in this chapter requiring explanation—we are informed by Daniel that it will terminate at the time "when he shall have accomplished to scatter the power of the *holy people*," xii. 7. In accordance with which St. John informs us that the oppressor of the saints, or *holy people*, "shall continue forty and two months," which is the same period; and again, that the two witnesses, one of whom we assume to be the Jewish Church, or *holy people*, shall prophesy in sackcloth during "one thousand two hundred and threescore days," or years. And this long period must necessarily be comprehended within "the times of the Gentiles."

Taking, then, the Apocalypse of St. John as the true interpreter of the Apocalypse of Daniel, how distinctly does the meaning of the seventh chapter of this prophet appear before our eyes ! How prominently does the "little horn," "speaking very great things," stand out in history. Our eyes are directed to the seven hills of Rome. We are confined to the selection thence of one of the ten fragments into which the last, or Roman empire has

* Rev. xvi. 10, 11.

long since been broken. And we are compelled to look amongst them for a little, but oppressive power, diverse from all which had preceded him, and "speaking very great things," who ought now to have existed, seated on those seven hills for the period of some 1260 years. Prejudice alone can prevent the recognition of the power here pointed out. It cannot be confounded with Antiochus.

It now only remains to be considered whether anything may reasonably be said concerning the time of the expiration of these 1260 years. And here, as entering into the region of conjecture, we shall be very brief. We are inclined to think that this period has no connexion with the other four periods above referred to, which relate to the east, and not to the west. We see no room left for doubt that these 1260 years mark the duration of the Papal power. The temporal power of the Papacy seems to be vanishing before our eyes, if indeed it has not already ceased to exist : but how long the spiritual power shall be allowed to linger on in the ancient seat of its dominion is a question to be solved by time. Wherever we may be disposed to fix the date of its commencement, it is clear that the time of expiration cannot be very far remote. We believe with a conviction, which may or may not be shared in by others, that we are living in days when the prophecies of Daniel are being, and are about to be, fulfilled with the same minute exactness, and perhaps with the same degree of absence of observation, as when our blessed Lord himself was born into the

world,—when “he was in the world,” and yet “the world knew it not.”

We now proceed to say a few words on chapter viii., that is to say, on the prophecy of the ram and the he-goat. Here, again, a reference to St. John, and the removal of the greater part of chap. xi. as an unauthorised application of this chapter to the days of the Maccabees, and the extinction thereby of Antiochus Epiphanes altogether from the field of view of the prophet, greatly facilitate the identification of the little horn, which is said to rise up towards the *latter end* of the four kingdoms into which the empire of the he-goat was to be divided. As the seat of the little horn of chap. vii. is fixed by St. John to the seven hills of Rome, so is the platform of the power of this second little horn of chap. viii. fixed with equal precision to the countries neighbouring upon the Holy Land. These two powers, therefore, can never properly be identified as one and the same, as is so earnestly contended for by Mr. Desprez. The ram with the two horns we are informed by the prophet represents the kings, or kingdoms, of Media and Persia; and the he-goat, as all admit, represents the kingdom of Alexander the Great. The little horn we read represents “a king of fierce countenance, and understanding dark sentences;” his distinguishing feature is that “he shall *destroy wonderfully*,” and “shall *destroy* the mighty and the holy people,” and “in peace shall *destroy* many,” v. 24, 25 : he is emphatically the *destroyer*.

We look, therefore, for a power trusting in the sword. The time of his appearance is during "*the last end of the indignation*," v. 19, that is, of the indignation against the holy people. He waxes great towards the south, towards the east, and towards the pleasant land ; he takes away the daily sacrifice ; he casts aside *the place* of the sanctuary ; and the sanctuary and the host are to remain trodden under foot "unto two thousand four hundred days," or years, "then shall the sanctuary be cleansed." Again, he is identified with the king, or power, which "shall do according to his will," xi. 36, who "shall speak marvellous things concerning the God of gods"—*El Elim*, and not regard the *Elohe* of his fathers, but shall honour (אלה) *Eloah*, or Allah of strongholds—the god of violence, as opposed to the God of Sabaoth, or Lord of the heavenly hosts ; who "*shall prosper till the indignation be accomplished*," and who "shall plant the tabernacles of his palaces between the seas in the glorious holy mountain," xi. 45, and *immediately after whose extinction the people of Daniel are to be delivered*, "*every one that shall be found written in the book*," xii. 1. In confirmation of which, it will be observed, that as in chap. viii., the king of fierce countenance is spoken of immediately in connexion with the latter end of the four kingdoms after Alexander ; so in chap. xi. 4–36, the king, who does according to his will, after removal of the interpolated comment,* is spoken of immediately in

* See pp. 112, 116.

connexion with the same four kingdoms after that of Alexander, "plucked up even for others besides those." Some of the distinguishing features mark the duration of this power as lasting even beyond the days in which we live, and others cannot be applied to the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes, even retrospectively. All the above characteristics are manifestly exhibited in the same remarkable power, viz. Mahomet and Mahomedanism,* as before observed. St. John clearly portrays this power in his description of the second woe trumpet, Rev. ix., where he speaks of the eruption of locusts as it were in breastplates, with "the sound of chariots and many horses running to battle," and with a king set over them, whose name in the Hebrew tongue is Abaddon, but in the Greek tongue, Apollyon, *the destroyer*. We know how the holy people were persecuted and destroyed by the Moslems, under the fierce guidance of Mahomet, whose "dark sentences" and revelations are set forth in the pages of his own dark Koran; how tribes of peaceful Jews and Christians who refused to accept the religion of the prophet were destroyed "in peace;" how the Jewish religious worship, with its daily sacrifice, which had been maintained in the kingdom of the Homerites, even till the year A.D.

* "Neither shall he regard the desire of women" (xi. 37). One of the distinguishing features of Mahomedanism is its utter disregard of sexual purity, so specially enforced by Christianity. Monks, nunnism, celibacy, were evils carried to excess in the days of Mahomet. The natural result of reaction was the license and laxity of polygamy.

627, was then finally taken away, for "the transgressors had come to the full," and had now even set their minds to root out Christianity ;* how the sanctuary, or rather the "place" of the sanctuary, then occupied by the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, was seized by the Caliph Omar, and "the tabernacles of his palaces," that is, the mosque bearing his name, planted on the glorious holy mountain, where it still remains ; how the holy people now are forbidden even to touch with the soles of their feet the holy ground ; and how "the two witnesses" of the Most High, both Judaism and Christianity, are prophesying in sackcloth and trodden under foot, till the power of the oppressor shall have been broken, though "without hand."

All this is simple, plain, and consistent, as long as the words of chap. xi. do not stand in the way to complicate the interpretation. On the other hand, if the whole of chap. xi. is to be accepted as an integral part of the original work of Daniel, Dr. Pusey, Mr. Desprez, Mr. Perowne, and many other interpreters, have shown us how we are constrained to identify the little horn of chap. viii. not with Mahomet, but with Antiochus Epiphanes ; who did, indeed, for three whole years, oppress and destroy the holy people, profane their sanctuary, and take away their daily sacrifices, but who has not prospered "till the indignation be accomplished," nor till the Almighty "shall have accomplished to scatter the

* Milman's "History of the Jews," vol. iii. p. 88.

power of the holy people." How also the periods of 1290, and 1335 days, or years, which are to be reckoned "from the time the daily sacrifice shall be taken away," even to the time when Daniel himself shall stand in his lot, xii. 13, and which must necessarily, according to their interpretation, be counted from the event spoken of in xi. 31, and therefore must have ended literally in that king's reign, are with any appearance of probability to be accounted for, has not, and cannot be explained by these interpreters. Gladly would we accept any reasonable explanation by which Antiochus could be made the type of the Mahomedan apostasy, and the genuineness of chap. xi. thereby made consistent with the genuineness of the remainder of the book. We confess, however, that we cannot fairly see our way to this result. Dr. Pusey repudiates any typical application of the numbers of Daniel. It is the confusion and difficulty introduced by this one chapter which has led to the rejection by so many of the whole book. A power rising up from amongst ten well-defined kings, successors of four notable kings, may perhaps be said to typify a power as distinctly declared to be about to rise at the latter times of the four. But the alternation of passages of text and application, and the inversion of historical characters in the chapter as now arranged, seems to be too obvious to be overlooked. For "the king" who "shall do according to his will," who "shall stand in the glorious land," who "shall come to his end, and none shall help

him," and "shall prosper till the indignation be accomplished," is not, according to the writer of chap. xi., to be identified with Antiochus Epiphanes, as Mr. Perowne assumes, and as indeed he ought to be if typical of Mahomet or anti-Christ; nor yet is he there represented as the future anti-Christ himself, as Dr. Pusey insists,* nor yet, again, can he be supposed to represent the Roman or papal power, as inferred by Sir Isaac Newton, Bishop Newton, Mr. Birks, and Mr. Elliot, arguing from the latter words of the supposed interpolated passage (xi. 31-35), for, as we have already shown, he is there clearly identified with no other than the father of Epiphanes, Antiochus the Great, by the same three characteristic expressions, "He shall do according to his own will;" "he shall stand in the glorious land;" "he shall stumble and fall, and not be found," and, therefore, not as the successor of, but as the immediate forerunner of the troubles under Epiphanes, but not of the "time of trouble such as never was," &c.

As regards the long period of 2400 days, or years, during which the sanctuary and the host are trodden under foot, which if interpreted in literal days, exceeds the term of six years, and is not therefore readily applicable to Epiphanes, we think, with Mr. Hatley Frere, that it is intended to represent a period of Jubilee of Jubilees, or 49 times 49 years, = 2401 years; and we suggest that it should be computed from the commencement of the new and

* Pusey's "Daniel," p. 95.

peculiar era of the Jubilee established by Ezra after the return from captivity.*

Now if we count 2400 years from the autumn B.C. 486, we come to the autumn of the year A.D. 1916, which is the commencement of the Sabbatical year 1916-17, and A.D. 1917-18, will therefore be the year in which a Jubilee of Jubilees hereafter will actually be completed. This, therefore, would seem to be a not improbable date for the cleansing of the sanctuary. But the date of the cleansing of the sanctuary is clearly defined in chap. xii. 11, by these words, "From the time that the daily sacrifice shall be taken away, and the abomination that maketh desolate set up, shall be 1290 days," or years. If, then, we are right in the interpretation that Mahomet took away the daily sacrifice in A.D. 627, by counting 1290 years from thence, we shall be led again to the same date A.D. 1917. Again, "Blessed is he that waiteth and cometh to the 1335 days," or years, that is, till the year A.D. 1961-2. Now the blessing attached to the termination of this last period marks it as an epoch of extreme significance. It seems to point to the blessed time of consummation, when that which is determined upon the desolate shall have been poured out, ix. 27 ; "when he shall have accomplished to scatter the power of the holy people," xii. 11 ; and when it shall be proclaimed, "Comfort ye, comfort ye my people, saith your God. Speak ye comfortably to Jerusalem, and cry

* P. 190.

unto her, that her warfare is accomplished, that her iniquity is pardoned ; for she hath received of the Lord's hand double for all her sins."—"Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make straight in the desert a highway for our God."—"And the glory of the Lord shall be revealed, and all flesh shall see it together ; for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it." But if indeed this is the glorious epoch which shall mark the termination of the warfare of Jerusalem, then should it also mark the termination of the times of the Gentiles. For our Lord himself has said, that "Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles till the time of the Gentiles be fulfilled." Now the times of the Gentiles, or of the casting off of the Jews, is commonly reckoned as "seven times," Lev. xxvi. 17-28, or 2520 years;* and as this period had a twofold commencement, first in the breaking up of the kingdom of the ten tribes, never since restored, threescore and five years after the first year of Ahaz,† that is, in B.C. 653 ; and secondly, in the completion of the fall and captivity of Judah, in the twenty-third year of Nebuchadnezzar, that is, in B.C. 560-559 ; so in like manner may we assume that it will have a twofold termination. Accordingly we find that 2520 years counted from B.C. 653 will lead us to the year A.D. 1867 ; and counted from B.C. 559 will lead us to A.D. 1961-2. We lay no stress on these numbers. They may be as illusive as many which have been before pro-

* Faber's Sac. Cal. of Prophecy.

† Isa. vii. 8.

INDIGNATION AGAINST ISRAEL.

"SEVEN TIMES."

$$7 \times 360 = 2520 \text{ years} = 1260 \times 2.$$

TIMES OF THE GENTILES.

2520 YEARS.

Ten tribes cut off

B.C. 654-653.*

2520 years

— 653

A.D. 1867

Two tribes cut off,

B.C. 560-559.

2520 years

— 559

A.D. 1961

PERSECUTION OF THE LATTER DAYS.

Papal.

Time times and a half

= 1260 years + A.D. 607.

= A.D. 1867.

Mahomedan.

1335 days, of

years + A.D. 627.

= A.D. 1961.

1290 years + A.D. 627

= A.D. 1917-16.

Sanctuary trodden under foot unto 2400 days, or years,
unto the year of Jubilee of Jubilees :

$$49 \times 49 = 2401 \text{ years.}$$

Era of Jubilee B.C. 485 + 486

 = A.D. 1916-17.

* See chronological table in the Appendix.

posed. Let them be rejected or taken into consideration according to the inclination of the reader. All we will say is, that the fulfilment of Daniel's prophetic periods would appear to be incapable of prolongation beyond the latter date, between which and now mighty changes may be accomplished.

In review then, of all that has been said, it would appear that a true understanding of the book of Daniel can only be attained to through many and great difficulties. We are met on the threshold by the fact of the existence of two different languages, Hebrew and Chaldee, in the same book, forming a stumbling-block to the faith of many, but to ourselves affording a striking evidence that the book was written at the time professed. It is encumbered by a chronology under which a prophecy of the deepest import, plainly worded, and, as we have shown, literally fulfilled, has become the subject of interminable and fruitless attempts at explanation, leading to the weakening rather than to the confirmation of faith. An uninspired fragment, as we believe, has been suffered to creep into the text, by means of which prophecies of remarkable clearness, as illustrated by subsequent history, have become so confused and obscured, as to give rise to the most contradictory interpretations from the hands of truly learned and pious men. While a latitude in construing numerical predictions, either in literal days, or in years, would seem to have been intentionally allowed by the prophet, in obedience to the command, to "shut up the words, and seal the book,

even to the time of the end ;" whereby certain prophecies have been found capable of application to several successive periods, and to widely distant times. The greatest of all difficulties, however, and one which will probably accompany this book even to the time of the accomplishment of all foretold, is that which is inherent in the mind of the interpreter himself.

For while it is obvious on the surface, that the book of Daniel relates especially, if not exclusively, to the destinies of God's people Israel, the largest and most influential section of Christian interpreters, approach it with the preconceived conclusion that the people of Israel are merely a people of the past, the refuse and outcasts of a bygone world. And that to believe that such a people as this can ever be resuscitated as a nation, or that hereafter they shall have any office assigned to them in the kingdom of the Son of Man, is to appropriate the glories of the Gentile church to a race for ever extinct and blotted out from the sight of God. Such a conviction has led, and in our opinion must continue to lead, to gross mis-interpretation of the words of Daniel. And here we find Drs. Williams, Pusey, Manning, and Newman, united together in the same band, arguing indeed from opposite extremes, yet, nevertheless, representing two different shades of the same opinion, each actively engaged in explaining away the direct meaning of Holy Scripture, and in allegorising the promises concerning Abraham and his seed, concerning David and the son of

David, as if they had reference only to the Gentile church.

Dr. Williams, who is the furthest in advance of this party, and who laughs at the direct Messianisms of Dr. Pusey, tauntingly lays down "the general proposition, that personal Messianic prophecies apply to the Lord Jesus only in a manner corresponding to that in which what was said of Israel may be applied to the church, the land of Canaan represents heaven, the river Jordan stands for death, the sojourn in the wilderness for human life, the passage of the Red Sea for baptism ;" and declares that "only in proportion as the class of (literal) interpretations here glanced at is absolutely surrendered, will students or congregations have any key to the profound moral significance of the Old Testament, or to the method by which prophecy may become a persuasive, if not an argument in favour of Christianity."* While Dr. Pusey, who faithfully adheres to the literal application of the Messianic prophecies to our blessed Lord, is equally anxious to wipe out the traces of His holy people, and to exclaim against the holy city Jerusalem, spoken of by the Lord Himself as "the city of the Great King,"—"down with it, down with it, even to the ground." Speaking of its past desolate condition, he writes,—“That desolation of 1800 years would not be less signal, if at any time the Jews should anew acquire property in

* Preface to "Desprez," p. lxvi.

Jerusalem, preparing the way probably for Anti-christ."* Dr. Manning, in his recent work on the office of the Holy Ghost, absorbed in the mysteries of his adopted church, scarcely recognises the operation of the Holy Spirit in the Jewish church of old, much less the future operation of the Holy Spirit on His people yet to come. While Dr. Newman, as before observed, takes refuge in horror in the Church of Rome, lest he should be contaminated even with the idea of a Protestant bishop at Jerusalem. With this class of interpreters, if Israel is to be scattered, and their cities laid waste, it is literally upon Israel that the curse is to be poured out. But if, when speaking of the days when a righteous branch which shall be raised unto David, it is said,—“In his days Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely.”† . . . “I will say, It is my people, and they shall say, The Lord is my God,”‡ then is the promise to be interpreted as applicable, not to Israel, but to the Gentile church. They believe that the Son of David was born into the world, “a light to lighten the Gentiles,” but they do not believe that He will hereafter “be the glory of His people Israel.” They believe in the temporal mission of the Holy Spirit, but not in the future temporal mission of the Son of Man.§ They understand the words, “a little while and ye shall not see me,” but see no force in the words “again a little while and ye shall see me,” “because I go

* Pusey's "Daniel," p. 189.

† Zech. xiii. 9.

‡ Jer. xxiii. 6.

§ 1 Cor. xv. 24-28.

to the Father." They realise the personal advent of the Son of Man in humility walking on this earth, and mixing with mankind, and rejected of His own people, but it is inconceivable to them that at His second advent He shall come unto His own again in glory, "that this same Jesus which is taken from you up into heaven shall so come in like manner as ye have seen Him go into heaven : " that He shall tread again upon this earth, mixing with mankind, and drinking again of the fruit of the vine ; that "His feet shall stand in that day upon the mount of Olives : " that all nations "shall go up from year to year to worship the King, the Lord of hosts, and to keep the feast of tabernacles : " * and that they shall see again His face, in that place which now is left desolate, and say unto Him, "Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord." They recognise the glory of the Son of God, but not the significance of His birth as Son of Man. They are full of exalted expectations of the glories of the Gentile "church triumphant," but unmindful that "if the casting away of the Jews is the reconciling of the world," the receiving of them shall be "as life from the dead." "Blindness in part has fallen upon Israel," but not a greater blindness than that which we are told may dim the eyes of the Gentile church, and which may cause it to be cut off.

* These perplexing passages in Zechariah are disposed of by Bunsen and others, by placing the writer before the time of the captivity ; by orthodox interpreters the feast of tabernacles signifies figuratively the Christian religion.

What is the history of the outward Church of God from the beginning, from which, nevertheless, a cloud of holy saints has been gathered, and is gathering, even till this day? Is it not a history of idolatry, rebellion, perversion of the word of God, yet not of persecution, as regards the Jewish Church: of heresy, schism, idolatry, superstition, persecution, blood-guiltiness, and at length of pride and arrogance reaching even up to heaven, on the part of its Gentile successor? In the Gentile Church there sits exalted the self-styled Vicar of Christ. Beside him, robed in scarlet, sit the so-called successors of the holy apostles. The kings of the earth are but as dust beneath their feet. The powers that be with them are not ordained of God. The very minor off-shoots of this towering Church rejoice in the appellation "High." All that is opposed to them is stigmatized as "Low." They cast away with scorn the tables of commandments given from Mount Sinai, and set up in their stead their own most strange devices. The "table of the Lord" entrusted to their care, has become the table of the money-changers. The beautiful doctrine of the "bread which came down from heaven,"—the spiritual sustenance of fainting souls,—is degraded into worship of material bread. Professing the doctrine of the one only God, as taught by the Lord Himself in His own perfect form of prayer, "Our Father which art in heaven," their teaching is of three co-equal, co-eternal Gods. And, crown-

ing all, they teach the worship of the "mother* of God," and her immaculate conception, giving "pardon to the sinner, grace to the just, joy to the angel, glory to the whole trinity,"† leading by one further step only to the final dogmatic blasphemy, of the only-begotten mother of God.

If, as we believe it is, the doom of this corrupt and superstitious Church to succumb before the children of the despised and outcast race, it cannot be but in words of blasphemy that such arrogance will be brought down from its lofty seat. The strong language of St. John concerning the Church of the seven hills, "Mystery, Babylon the Great, the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth, drunken with the blood of the saints and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus," is not too strong to represent the corruption and false worship taught by this pernicious Church, and by its many base imitations.

Let us look around upon the three great sections of devout worshippers of the Almighty God throughout the world. On the sons of Jacob scattered, though unmixed, in every quarter of the habitable earth: on the sons of Ishmael mighty in the east: on the sons of the Gentiles mighty in

* Mr. Newman calls upon us also for "religious affection and veneration" towards the "foster-father" of God. Why not also towards the brothers and sisters of God? The true answer to Mr. Newman is contained in Rev. xiii. 1. "And upon his heads the name of blasphemy."—"Letter to Pusey," p. 33.

† Middleton's "Letter from Rome," Preface, p. 44.

the west. All within the ranks, both here and there, is restlessness and commotion. The sons of Jacob, bending their eager eyes towards the holy city—to the place of their loved temple which is desolate—think upon her stones, and pray for repossession of the land of everlasting covenant with their fathers. There is “a noise” and “a shaking,” as it were in the valley of dry bones, as if the bones were coming together, “bone to his bone,” and that breath was being breathed again into the slain that they might live. The devout sons of Ishmael, with their eyes directed towards their temple at Mecca—preferring the cool waters of the well of Zem-zem to the soft flowing waters of Siloam, and the false prophet of Arabia to the great high-priest of the order of Melchizedec—are conscious of their waning influence throughout the East. While the sons of the Gentiles, looking scornfully at Jerusalem, and straining their eyes into the far east, they know not where, in search of something, they know not what, are equally conscious of their utter incapacity to cope with the mighty work which lies before them, of bringing the heathen nations of the now opening East within the dominion of the Son of Man. Some with pious zeal are seen searching amongst the fathers, hoping that some light out of darkness may thence be cast upon their bewildered steps. Others are found raking amongst the cast-off garments of mediæval ritualism, as if they thought thereby to clothe themselves with righteousness,

and thus command respect. While the great leaders of our own local Church, in the full sense of the weakness of division, are zealously seeking for union with Churches more corrupt than their own, in the hope that the combined weight of united Christendom may be enabled to withstand the shock with which the whole body now is threatened. The task we believe is hopeless. The corrupt teaching of Christendom is leading fast to infidelity, and except as regards its reformed and purer branches, sparsely scattered here and there, we believe that the whole Gentile Church is hastening onwards to destruction.

But when "Babylon is fallen, is fallen, that great city, because she made all nations drink of the wine of the wrath of her fornication," shall God be left without a witness on this earth? Where, then, shall we look for the visible Church of Christ which shall take up the work of God, "having the everlasting Gospel to preach unto them that dwell on the earth, and to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people?" St. John informs us that he saw an "angel ascending from the east, having the seal of the living God:" that at the time of the fall of Babylon, he looked, "and lo! a lamb stood on the Mount Sion, and with him one hundred and forty-four thousand having *his Father's name written in their foreheads*," and these one hundred and forty-four thousand are said to be sealed "*of all the tribes of the children of Israel*," "and they sing the *song of Moses, the servant of God*, and the song of the Lamb." Now it

is inconceivable that these words, though figurative, can be intended to lead our minds to the idea of a Church whose incense, altars, images, polytheism, prostration towards the east, all proclaim its pagan origin, and whose seat is well defined as on the seven hills of pagan Rome. But on the contrary, they do distinctly lead our thoughts to the lost and wandering sheep of the house of Israel,—to that people, who, “as touching the election,” are beloved for the Father’s sake,” and to their promised restoration to Mount Sion. We call to mind the words of our blessed Lord, when announcing to the woman of Samaria that the worship at Jerusalem was then soon about to cease, that “Salvation is of the Jews.” We believe, with St. Paul, that “there shall come out of Sion the deliverer, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob. For this is my covenant with them when I shall take away their sins.”

We rejoice, then, in the fact that a Protestant bishop is now seated at Jerusalem, representing the purest form of the religion of Christ. We shall rejoice still more when we see a chief rabbi at Jerusalem representing the whole race of Israel throughout the world, and so placed in communication with the heads of our reformed Church.

For the name of Jesus is now no longer blasphemed by this devout and deeply-humbled people. On the contrary, His name is honoured, and in many instances His character and office far more duly

appreciated by the Jews than by many of the Church of Rome. Already that one single prayer taught by the Lord Himself, which sounds the key-note of the one harmonious universal Church which shall prevail, when "the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord as the waters cover the sea," would fall with far more grace and dignity from the lips of the sons of Abraham, than from those who mumble and mutter it over the rosary of fifteen paternosters and one hundred and fifty Ave Marias. We think we see the day, and that not far distant, when in the extended courts of the future temple of Mount Sion the song of Moses and of the Lamb shall be resounded, not in the soft melodious tones of our cathedral choirs, nor in the loud discordant music which now disturbs the churches of this land, but in the stout and manly tones of voices, such as are now only heard in the reformed churches of some neighbouring lands, of thousands and thousands of the restored seed of Abraham, in solemn deep-toned songs of praise, in some such words as these :—

"We praise thee, O God : we acknowledge thee to be the Lord.

All the earth doth worship thee : the Father everlasting.

To thee all Angels cry aloud : the Heavens, and all the Powers therein.

To thee Cherubin and Seraphin : continually do cry,

Holy, Holy, Holy : Lord God of Sabaoth ;
Heaven and earth are full of the Majesty : of
thy Glory.

The glorious company of the Apostles : praise
thee.

The goodly fellowship of the Prophets : praise
thee.

The noble army of Martyrs : praise thee.

The holy Church throughout all the world :
doth acknowledge thee ;

The Father of an infinite Majesty ;

Thine honourable, true : and only Son ;

Also the Holy Ghost : the Comforter.

Thou art the King of Glory : O Christ.

Thou art the everlasting Son : of the Father.

When thou tookest upon thee to deliver man :
thou didst not abhor the Virgin's womb.

When thou hadst overcome the sharpness of
death : thou didst open the Kingdom of Heaven to
all believers.

Thou sittest at the right hand of God : in the
Glory of the Father.

We believe that thou shalt come : to be our
Judge.

We therefore pray thee, help thy servants :
whom thou hast redeemed with thy precious blood.

Make them to be numbered with thy Saints : in
glory everlasting.

O Lord, save thy people : and bless thine heritage.
Govern them : and lift them up for ever.

Day by day : we magnify thee ;
And we worship thy Name : ever world without
end.

Vouchsafe, O Lord : to keep us this day without
sin.

O Lord, have mercy upon us : have mercy upon
us.

O Lord, let thy mercy lighten upon us : as our
trust is in thee.

O Lord, in thee have I trusted : let me never be
confounded."

REPLY TO OBJECTIONS.

1. As to the age of Daniel at his death.

It has been objected, that if Daniel lived, as we have argued, to the year B.C. 492, when Darius, son of Hystaspes, was about sixty-two years of age, and had been carried captive to Babylon in the third year of Jehoiakim, B.C. 583, at least eighty years before his death, and was, say twelve years of age at the date of his captivity, he must have lived to the great age of 102, or upwards, which is assumed to be improbable.*

This objection we think is sufficiently answered by the explanation already given, that neither Josephus, nor any other ancient interpreter of Daniel, ever placed his captivity so early as the third of Jehoiakim's reign. But they are all agreed that the third year spoken of in Daniel i. 1, is the third year of Jehoiakim's revolt from Nebuchadnezzar, B.C. 575, not 583, according to our reckoning, which makes all the difference required. For if, as we believe, he was carried to Babylon with Jechoniah in B.C. 575 or 574, and saw his last visions in the year B.C. 492, that is eighty-two years after ; his age when he died may not have been more than ninety-four, which is by no means incredible.

2. As to the title "Darius son of Ahasuerus of the seed of the Medes."

* The author can testify to an instance of longevity in a lady in Cornwall, who attained to the age of 104, retaining all her faculties.

It is objected that Darius, son of Hystaspes, was a Persian, not a Mede. How then could Daniel, who was well acquainted with his lineage, speak of him as "Darius the Median?" And if he was son of Hystaspes, how could he be styled "son of Ahasuerus?" With regard to the first supposed difficulty, there is really none. Daniel, writing at Babylon, looked upon "Medes and Persians" as but one kingdom. When the hand-writing on the wall announced to Belshazzar that his kingdom was divided, and by the choice of the word U-pharsin, the Persians were specially pointed out as the conquering nation, the word is immediately interpreted by Daniel as signifying "the Medes and Persians." As late as the time of Thucydides, the war with Persia was called the Median war, and those who fell away to the Persians were said to Medize. Herodotus speaks of Cyrus as "king of the Medes," and of the fleet of Darius, son of Hystaspes, as "the Median fleet." The difficulty raised on the words "son of Ahasuerus," seems hardly reasonable from the mouth of those who look upon Darius, son of Ahasuerus, as Cyaxares son of Astyages, or Astyages son of Cyaxares, and find no difficulty in identifying Ahasuerus of Ezra iv. 6, with Cambyses. There should be no difficulty with such interpreters in allowing that Ahasuerus might stand for Hystaspes. Nevertheless we cannot approve of such identifications. Daniel knew his own master's title, and has no doubt faithfully recorded it. Ahasuerus is unquestionably the equivalent in Hebrew for the

Median title Cyaxares. It is also generally admitted by modern linguists, that it is the equivalent of the Persian title Xerxes; and if so, there are two modes of accounting for the title assumed by the Persian Darius, either in connexion with Cyaxares, or with Xerxes. The word "son" in Hebrew, all are aware, may stand either for son-in-law, heir, or successor on the throne. Now Cyaxares or Ahasuerus, the uncle of Cyrus, left no male heir; he had married the Jewess Hadassah, which is the same as 'Atossa, and he died, we may suppose, leaving her a widow. Darius the son of Hystaspes we know was an usurper, and every pretender to the throne of the Medes in his days, as recorded in the still extant inscriptions of Darius, claimed descent from Cyaxares or Ahasuerus, the last Median king.

If such, then, were the facts, what is more probable than that Darius, who sought favour with the Medes, should have married the widowed queen 'Atossa, or Esther, the aunt of Cyrus, and so have claimed to be the rightful successor to the throne of Media? Herodotus, who, at this point is much astray in his chronological reckoning, attests indeed that Darius married 'Atossa, but he calls her daughter of Cyrus instead of aunt. But there is another possible solution of the difficulty, if it is lawful to suggest a very slight alteration of the present text of Daniel. We have said that Darius took the government of the Babylonian and Assyrian provinces into his own hands, when, at the age of sixty-two, that is on the final conquest and destruction of

Babylon, under Belshazzar, the son probably of Nabonidus, whom he may have set up as tributary king or viceroy, and that this took place in the year B.C. 493. It was somewhere about this time also we know that he set out on his Scythian expedition, from which he might never have returned, and according to the ordinary practice in Persia, he would, we may assume, have appointed one of his sons to rule till his return.

There is an Egyptian monument referred to by Dr. Birch,* which seems to confirm this suggestion. For, as Dr. Birch observes, the 12th year of Xerxes on this monument is made concurrent with the 36th of Darius. So that if this 12th year commenced in B.C. 482, as we have deduced from the Parian chronicle, in the 36th year of Darius, the first year of Xerxes would fall in with B.C. 493. The Septuagint translator of Dan. ix. 1, reads, "In the first year of Darius son of Xerxes," οἱ ἐβασίλευσαν, that is, "who together reigned over the realm of the Chaldeans." Now this use of the plural is very remarkable, and suggests the idea that the original words of the text were not "In the first year of Darius son of Ahasuerus," but "In the first year of Darius *and* Ahasuerus, who reigned," &c., *i. e.* in B.C. 493, a reading which would bring the books of Daniel, Zechariah, and Ezra, into perfect harmony.

3. It may be asked, How could Belshazzar, who drank out of the golden and silver vessels taken

* See Loftus' "Chaldaea and Susiana," p. 412.

from the temple of Jerusalem, Dan. v. 2, have been slain on that occasion in B.C. 493, when we read in the book of Ezra that Cyrus, long before that date, had delivered these same vessels to Mithredates the treasurer, and that they were brought by Sheshbazzar to Jerusalem. Here apparently would seem to be a difficulty. But if we refer to Josephus, we find that these vessels were indeed delivered to Mithredates, and were ordered also to be delivered to Sheshbazzar, but not till the building of the temple should be finished. As we know, therefore, that the decree of Cyrus for the building of the temple was suspended, and not put in execution till the second year of Darius, B.C. 491, according to our reckoning, it would appear that the vessels of the temple may have been still at Babylon in B.C. 493.*

4. But, again, it may be asked, is it consistent with history to place the final destruction of Babylon by Darius when he carried off the gates, so late as the year B.C. 493. Herodotus places the fall of Babylon after a siege of twenty months, early in the reign of Darius. But there is every reason to believe that he is here greatly in error. The extant inscriptions of the early years of Darius, describe two captures of Babylon, but neither of them took place after so long a siege as twenty months, or in a manner in any way corresponding to his description; while Ctesias, who is a far better authority on Persian history, distinctly contradicts Herodotus on this

* Josephus, Ant. xi. 1, 3.

very point, telling us that all which is related by him concerning Zopyrus in the reign of Darius, took place really under Xerxes. Now Xerxes, according to our arrangement, might probably have accompanied Darius in his expedition against Babylon in the year B.C. 495, in which year, if the siege was finished in B.C. 493, the expedition must have set out. Herodotus places the last revolt of the Babylonians immediately after the sailing of the Persian fleet to Samos. But the fleet of Darius sailed twice to that island, once to place Syloson on the throne, and a second time to restore Æaces son of Syloson, about the year B.C. 495. Herodotus, who had probably noted down correctly the connexion of the revolt with the sailing of the fleet, has, we submit, mistaken one occasion for the other when writing his history.

APPENDIX.

THE following treatise on the Sabbatical years and Jubilees of the Jews, forms part of a chronological treatise comprehending Egyptian, Babylonian, Assyrian, Tyrian, Median, and Lydian chronology, based upon the fundamental date, B.C. 583-2, or the date of the battle of Carchemish, between Pharaoh-Necho and Nebuchadnezzar, which took place about the time of the final destruction of Nineveh, and soon after the date of the eclipse of Thales, now finally fixed by astronomers to the year B.C. 585, twenty-five years lower than the commonly supposed date. This treatise was published in the year 1863, in the transactions of the Chronological Institute of London. The author was not at that time aware of a valuable treatise, written by Dr. B. Zuchermann of Breslau, in the year 1857, on the same subject. He has since procured that work, and caused it to be translated, and it is published in the Transactions of the above Society. He is pleased to find that the conclusion which he had arrived at, viz :—that the period of the Jubilee was not a period of fifty years, as generally supposed, but a period of forty-nine years, as maintained by Rabbi Jehuda and the Geonim, coincides with the opinion of Dr. Zuchermann, and also that the series of computed Sabbatical years after the captivity of the Jews at Babylon entirely agrees with his computation. A perusal of Dr. Zuchermann's treatise is strongly recommended to any one desirous of acquainting himself with Jewish opinions and controversy on the subject.

There are two points, however, upon which Dr. Zuchermann has not treated, and upon which the author trusts that he has thrown some light in the following observations.

The great difficulty which meets one at the threshold of the subject is, how to believe that any legislator, especially the supreme legislator of all, should have instituted the observance by his people of two successive years of fallow, during which neither seed should be sown nor fruit gathered out of the field, which, according to the law, as laid down in Leviticus xxv., would be the case in every fiftieth year, when after the completion of the forty-ninth year, which was Sabbatical, it was immediately followed by the year of jubilee. This obvious difficulty has given rise to much discordance of opinion, and many accordingly have suggested that the jubilee was not concurrent with the fiftieth, but with the forty-ninth, or Sabbatical year.

The simple solution of the difficulty here suggested is, that the fiftieth year, or jubilee, was concurrent with the first year of the septennial cycle which followed the seventh Sabbatical year; and that it was not, as generally assumed, commanded to be observed as a fallow by the nation at large, but only by those who were the objects of the institution of the Jubilee, and who alone partook of its benefits, that is, those who, having dispossessed themselves of their inheritance within the previous forty-nine years, came again into possession in the 50th year. By means of this solution all difficulty in the way of the early tradition of Rabbi Jehuda is removed. For thus the jubilee becomes a year of cultivation for the nation in general, but of fallow for those who came into possession of lands in that year.

Dr. Zuchermann again is quite at a loss how to fix upon any one year throughout the whole Jewish history as a year actually observed, or computed, as a Jubilee, and this difficulty must ever remain, as long as erroneous chronological reckonings such as are adopted both by Christians and Jews, continue to be applied towards the explanation of Holy Scripture. On the other hand, if there is sufficient ground for adopting the reckoning proposed in the foregoing pages, it

will readily be seen how the whole series of Jubilees fall of their own accord into place, and how when so arranged they coincide with certain remarkable allusions in history pointing to such years. The materials to be derived from Scripture and Jewish tradition are amply sufficient, when properly handled, for placing the whole question of the Sabbatical years in connexion with the Jubilee on a secure foundation; and to effect this, and to show the important bearing of these sacred cycles upon sacred history, is the object of the following dissertation.

HEBREW CHRONOLOGY IN CONNECTION WITH THE SABBATICAL YEARS AND JUBILEES.

THE battle of Carchemish, in the year B.C. 583-2, or, more accurately, in the spring of the year B.C. 582, is the key to Hebrew chronology, because this battle was fought in the fourth year of the reign of Jehoiakim, king of Judah, as Jeremiah attests,* and from thence we compute with certainty, through the Hebrew Scriptures, the dates and reigns of the whole succession of kings of Judah, from the first year of Solomon, in whose reign Jerusalem was consecrated as the "holy city," to the last year of Zedekiah, when that city together with its temple, was destroyed by the Chaldeans.

We have already seen how the date of this battle, thus placed, being the date also of the first year of Nebuchadnezzar, and the last year of Pharaoh-Necho, king of Egypt, has led to the recovery of a very early mode of reckoning the chronology of the kingdoms of Assyria, Babylon, and Lydia—how the rise of the kingdom of Babylon under Nebuchadnezzar thus immediately follows the final destruction of Nineveh, soon after the eclipse of B.C. 585—and how, in accordance with this fundamental date, Egyptian, Tyrian, and Median Chronology, in conjunction with the chronology of these other nations, form together one harmonious system.

The system of dates thus recovered is that which appears to have been entertained by learned men in the illustrious age of literature which followed upon the conquest of Asia by the Greeks, and is based accordingly, as we have seen, upon the authority of such writers as Berosus (quoted by Josephus, Abydenus, and Polyhistor), as Megasthenes, Manetho, Dino,

* Jer. xli. 2.

Sabbatical Years and Jubilees.

B.C.			
3	1	Solomon.	
2	2		
1	3		[481st from Moses.
990	4		480th year from the Exodus.
9	5		2 Kings, vi. 1.
8	6		
7	7		
6	8		
5	9		
4	10		
3	11		
2	12	Era of the	Dedication* of the Temple in the
1	13	Temple, 1	year of Jubilee, in the 490th
980	14	or of the 2	year from the mission of Moses.
9	15	"holy city." 3	
8	16	4	
7	17	5	
6	18	6	
5	19	7	
4	20	8	
3	21	9	
2	22	10	
1	23	11	
970	24	12	Solomon finishes his palace.
9	25	13	
8	26	14	
7	27	15	
6	28	16	
5	29	17	
4	30	18	
3	31	19	
2	32	20	
1	33	21	
960	34	22	

* Temple finished in the eighth month of the eleventh year. (1 Kings, vi. 38.) Dedicated in the seventh month of the following year. (viii. 2.) The city of Zion now first became the "holy city."

Demetrius, the author of the Parian Chronicle, and others of that early age of literature; while, on the other hand, with all due deference to Josephus, and the later Christian writers, such as Africanus, Eusebius, and especially Clemens Alexandrinus, as regards the valuable records of history and chronology which they have preserved to us, we have rejected their systematic chronographies as founded on an erroneous adaptation of heathen chronology to Scriptural events, and as, in fact, subversive of the plain Hebrew reckoning which it is our object now to re-establish.

If the battle of Carchemish, in the year B.C. 582, was fought in the fourth year of the reign of Jehoiakim, king of Judah, then must the succession of kings of Judah from Solomon to Zedekiah have been as follows:—

*Canon of the Reigns of the Kings of Judah, according to
Demetrius.*

Solomon	.	.	40 years from B.C. 993*	
Rehoboam	.	.	17	953
Abijah	.	.	3	936
Asa	.	.	40 (41 current)	933
Jehoshaphat	.	.	25	893
Jehoram	.	.	7 (8 current)	868
Ahaziah	.	.	1	861
Athaliah	.	.	6	860
Joash	.	.	40	854
Amaziah	.	.	29	814
Uzziah	.	.	52	785
Jotham	.	.	16	733
Ahaz	.	.	15 (16 current)	717
Hezekiah	.	.	29	702
Manasseh	.	.	55	673
Amon	.	.	2	618

* Lepsius places the first year of Solomon in B.C. 992, and the first of Rehoboam in B.C. 953. But shortens the reign of Manasseh by 20 years.—*Königsbuch der Ägypter*. Tafeln, p. 8.

Sabbatical Years and Jubilees.

B.C.			
9	35	Solomon.	Jeroboam takes refuge in Egypt.
8	36		
7	37		
6	38		
5	39		
4	40		390 years before the fall of Jerusalem. (Ezek. iv. 4, 5.)
3	1	Rehoboam.	
2	2		
1	3		
950	4		
		Era of the Temple.	32
9	5		Shishak, king of Egypt, attacks Jerusalem.
8	6		
7	7		
6	8		
5	9		
4	10		
3	11		
2	12		
1	13		
940	14		
			42
9	15		
8	16		
7	17		
6	1	Abijah.	
5	2		
4	3		
3	1	Asa.	
2	2		
1	3		
930	4		
			52
9	5		
8	6		
7	7		
6	8		
5	9		
4	10		
3	11		
2	12		
1	13		
920	14		
			62

Josiah . . .	31	(16 current)	616
Jehoahaz . .		3 ^m	586
Jehoiakim . .	11	„ „	585
Jechoniah . .		3 ^m	574
Zedekiah . .	11	„ „	573
		to	563

Now, this arrangement of the chronology of the kings of Judah, derived from the date of the battle of Carchemish, is neither more nor less than that of Demetrius, the Jewish historian, who wrote in the third century B.C., and whose Canon of the reigns of the kings of Judah, as above set forth, has been reconstructed from three leading dates preserved by Clemens Alexandrinus, in a passage which we shall presently quote.

Demetrius is spoken of by Eusebius,* in connexion with Philo, Aristobulus, Josephus, and Eupolemus, all Jewish writers; and he was, no doubt, one of those Hellenistic Jews who, under the domination of the Greeks in Asia, had adopted, as was then the custom, a Greek name. The works of Demetrius have not come down to us; and it is only through Josephus, Clemens Alexandrinus, Jerome, and Eusebius, that we have any knowledge of, or reference to, his writings. He is evidently referred to as a writer of considerable note.

The fundamental date from which Demetrius reckoned his chronology upwards, was the first year of the reign of Ptolemy Philopator, king of Egypt, from which it may be inferred that he lived in that king's reign, and wrote about the year B.C. 222. We have observed that this was a period of great learning and research. The successors of Alexander we know were promoters of literature in every branch. The historical records of the several Eastern nations under their dominion were sought for and published in the Greek language; and the science of chronology, which was carefully studied at that time, boasts of the great name of Eratosthenes, the father of chronology, whose works are lost, and of the un-

* Ecclesiastical History, ch. xiii.

Sabbatical Years and Jubilees.

B.C.			
9	15	Asa.	Covenant renewed in the Sabbatical year.
8	16		
7	17		
6	18		
5	19		
4	20		
3	21		
2	22		
1	23		
910	24	72	
9	25		
8	26		
7	27		
6	28		
5	29		
4	30		
3	31		
2	32		
1	33		
900	34	82	
9	35		Asa sends gifts to Benhadad, king of Syria. (2 Chron. xvi. 2.)
8	36		
7	37		
6	38		
5	39		
4	40	41 current.	
3	1	Jehosaphat.	
2	2		
1	3		
890	4	92	
9	5		The book of the law read in the Sabbatical year. (2 Chron. xvii. 9.)
8	6		
7	7		
6	8		
5	9		
4	10		
3	11		
2	12		
1	13		
880	14	102	
			Benhadad attacks Samaria.

known writer of the Parian Chronicle,* both of whom must have been contemporary, or nearly so, with Demetrius. Demetrius wrote, therefore, rather more than 300 years after the death of Nebuchadnezzar, about the same length of time before Josephus, and 530 years before Eusebius. He is the first Jewish writer who has synchronised events in Jewish history with known periods in secular history; and writing, as we have observed, in an age of learning and cultivation, his testimony deserves to be looked upon with extreme reverence.

From Clemens Alexandrinus we learn that Demetrius wrote a history of the kings of Judah, and in a short passage from the *Stromata* † of that learned writer, we obtain an outline of his chronology from the time of Shalmanezzer, king of Assyria, who put an end to the kingdom of Israel, to the reign of Ptolemy Philopator, the fourth king of Egypt, bearing that title. The passage runs thus:—

“Demetrius says, in his work concerning the kings of Judea, that the tribes of Benjamin and Levi were not carried into captivity by Senacherim; but that from this captivity (*i.e.* in the reign of Sennacherib, by whom, according to Assyrian inscriptions, now extant, many captives were carried from Judea) to the last captivity from Jerusalem under Nebuchadnezzar (*i.e.* in the 23rd year of his reign), was a period of 128 years and 6 months. And that from the time when the ten tribes were carried away from Samaria (*i.e.* in the reign of Shalmanezzer) to the reign of the fourth Ptolemy was a period of 473‡ years and 9 months, and from the carrying away from Jerusalem 338 years and 3 months.”

Now, here is no loose reckoning in round numbers, which are, of course, always more or less inexact; but the passage quoted, as originally written, was clearly intended to convey a statement of the exact dates, even to a single month, of three

* This Chronicle has been attributed by some to Demetrius Phalereus.

† Clem. Alex. Heinsii. Strom. i. p. 337.

‡ The figures are 573 in the present copies of Clemens. The context clearly requires 473.

Sabbatical Years and Jubilees.

B.C.		
9	15	Jehosophat.
8	16	Era of the Temple.
7	17	
6	18	
5	19	
4	20	
3	21	
2	22	
1	23	
870	24	112
9	25	Hazeal anointed king before the death of Benhadad. (1 Kings, xix. 15 ; 2 Kings, viii. 15.)
8	1 Jehoram.	
7	2	
6	3	
5	4	
4	5	
3	6	
2	7 8 current.	
1	1 Ahaziah.	
860	1 Athaliah. 122	
9	2	Carthage founded 144 years after the fourth year of Solomon. Death of Benhadad.*
8	3	
7	4	
6	5	
5	6	
4	1 Jehoash.	
3	2	
2	3	
1	4	
850	5	132
9	6	Carthage founded 144 years after the fourth year of Solomon. Death of Benhadad.*
8	7	
7	8	
6	9	
5	10	
4	11	
3	12	
2	13	
1	14	
840	15	142

* Rawlinson's Assyrian Canon fixes the death of Benhadad in the year B.C. 844. Benhadad was probably about eighty years of age at that time, seeing that he reigned in the time of Asa. Hazeal, therefore, his son, had command of his army, and was associated on the throne sixteen years before his father's death.

captivities, which marked the transport of the children of Israel from their own land into the cities of the Medes and the dominions of the king of Babylon.

Ptolemy Philopator began to reign in Nov. B.C. 222=221-2 ^m	
From thence to the 23rd year of Nebuchadnezzar	338 3

	B.C. 559-5 ^m
From thence to the invasion of Sennacherib, in	
the 14th year of Hezekiah	128-6
	B.C. 687-11 ^m

Again, from the first year of Ptolemy Philopator=B.C. 221-2 ^m	
To the carrying away of the ten tribes	473-9
	B.C. 694-11 ^m

So that, according to Demetrius, the deportation of captives by Sennacherib took place in Feb. B.C. 688; that is, towards the end of the 14th year of Hezekiah: the carrying away of the ten tribes in Feb. B.C. 695, that is, towards the end of the 7th year of Hezekiah: * and the last captivity of Judah in Aug. B.C. 560, or 23rd year of Nebuchadnezzar. From these three leading dates it is easy to reconstruct, as we have done, the whole list of reigns of the kings of Judah, which we have denominated the Canon of Demetrius.

But again, the correctness of this Canon has been confirmed by the exact agreement of the date therein assigned to the 4th year of Solomon, in which year the building of the temple of Jerusalem was commenced, viz. B.C. 990, with the date of the commencement of the building as collected, through Josephus, from the Tyrian annals preserved by Menander.†

* The sixth year according to the Hebrew text, the seventh according to Josephus.

† See Tyrian Chronology. Trans. Chron. Inst. vol. ii. part iii.

Sabbatical Years and Jubilees.

B.C.		
9	16 Jehoash.*	Era of the Temple.
8	17	
7	18	
6	19	
5	20	
4	21	
3	22	
2	23	
1	24	
830	25	152
9	26	
8	27	
7	28	
6	29	
5	30	
4	31	
3	32	
2	33	
1	34	
820	35	162
9	36	Hazael threatens Jerusalem. 2 Kings, xii. 17.
8	37	
7	38	
6	39	
5	40	
4	1 Amaziah.	
3	2	
2	3	
1	4	
810	5	172
9	6	
8	7	
7	8	
6	9	
5	10	
4	11	
3	12	
2	13	
1	14	
800	15	182

* Lepsius places each of these reigns two years earlier.

From the flight of Dido in the 7th year of	
Pygmalion	B.C. = 846
To the 4th year of Solomon	144 yrs.
	<hr/>
	B.C. 990

Such is the well-defined outline of the Chronology of the times of the Hebrew monarchy, derived from three different sources of inquiry, and corroborated, as we have seen, by contemporaneous records recovered from the ruined palaces of the kings of Assyria.

We now propose to test the accuracy of this outline of Scripture chronology by the most rigid and, at the same time, the most appropriate test which can be applied to it, that is to say, its conformity or otherwise with a peculiar measure of time, which we know to have been in use amongst the Jews, and by which they are distinguished from all other nations in the world,—the sacred calendar of Sabbatical years and Jubilees. This calendar of consecrated years is the true test of the accuracy or inaccuracy of every scheme of Hebrew chronology which may be propounded: and as it is a striking proof of the utter worthlessness of the commonly received reckoning, that confessedly it draws no support from the Sabbatical years and Jubilees, and that the remarkable reference to such a mode of computation in the ninth chapter of the book of Daniel, in no way can be made to fall in with that reckoning; so is the fact, of the simple manner in which each recorded Sabbath and Jubilee, and especially the prophetic words of Daniel, fall in with the proposed reckoning, one of the most interesting and conclusive arguments in favour of the arrangement of dates now before us. “Hallow my sabbaths, and they shall be a sign between me and you, that ye may know that I am the Lord your God.”*

All Hebrew chronology ought necessarily to resolve itself into a series of septennial periods, marked by consecrated

* Ezek. xx. 20.

Sabbatical Years and Jubilees.

B.C.		
9	16	Amaziah.
8	17	Era of the Temple.
7	18	
6	19	
5	20	
4	21	
3	22	
2	23	
1	24	
790	25	
9	26	Uzziah.
8	27	
7	28	
6	29	
5	1	
4	2	
3	3	
2	4	
1	5	
780	6	202
9	7	
8	8	
7	9	
6	10	
5	11	
4	12	
3	13	
2	14	
1	15	
770	16	212
9	17	
8	18	
7	19	
6	20	
5	21	
4	22	
3	23	
2	24	
1	25	
760	26	222

years of rest, during which it was ordained that the land should remain untilled, in conformity with the command, "When ye come into the land which I give you, then shall the land keep a sabbath unto the Lord. Six years thou shalt sow thy field, and six years thou shalt prune thy vineyard, and gather in the fruit thereof; but in the seventh year shall be a sabbath of rest unto the land, a sabbath for the Lord: thou shalt neither sow thy field, nor prune thy vineyard. That which groweth of its own accord of thy harvest thou shalt not reap, neither gather the grapes of thy vine undressed; for it is a year of rest unto the land. And the sabbath of the land shall be meat for you; for thee, and for thy servant, and for thy maid, and for thy hired servant, and for thy stranger that sojourneth with thee, and for thy cattle, and for the beast that are in thy land, shall all the increase thereof be meat. And thou shalt number seven sabbaths of years unto thee, seven times seven years; and the space of the seven sabbaths of years shall be unto thee forty and nine years. Then shalt thou cause the trumpet of the Jubilee to sound on the tenth day of the seventh month." "And ye shall hallow the fiftieth year, and proclaim liberty throughout all the land unto all the inhabitants thereof: it shall be a jubilee unto you; and ye shall return every man unto his possession, and ye shall return every man unto his family." "And if thou sell ought unto thy neighbour, or buyest ought of thy neighbour's hand, ye shall not oppress one another: according to the number of years after the Jubilee thou shalt buy of thy neighbour, and according unto the number of years of the fruits he shall sell unto thee."*

That the reckoning of these consecrated years was preserved by the Jews down to the time of the destruction of Jerusalem by the Chaldeans, appears to be established beyond dispute by one single incidental passage in the prophet Ezekiel. While the armies of the Chaldeans were hovering over Judea, and threatening desolation to the land, he exclaims, "The

* Lev. xxv. 2-15.

Sabbatical Years and Jubilees.

B.C.		
9	27	Uzziah.
8	28	Era of the Temple.
7	29	
6	30	
5	31	
4	32	
3	33	
2	34	
1	35	
750	36	232
9	37	1 Menahem gave Pul, king of 2 Assyria, 1000 talents. 3 2 Kings, xv. 19. 4 5 6 7
8	38	
7	39	
6	40	
5	41	
4	42	
3	43	
2	44	
1	45	
740	46	242
9	47	8 9 10 Tiglath Pileser takes tribute of Menahem and Uzziah in the year B.C. 738.*
8	48	
7	49	
6	50	
5	51	
4	52	
3	1 Jotham.†	
2	2	
1	3	
730	4	252
9	5	
8	6	
7	7	
6	8	
5	9	
4	10	
3	11	
2	12	
1	13	
720	14	262

* Rawlinson's Canon, see p. 40. Chron. Trans. vol. ii. part iii.

† Gumpach, after curtailing the reign of Uzziah to 42 years, makes the first of Jotham B.C. 733.—*Zeitrech. der Bab. und Assy.*, p. 174.

and threatening desolation to the land, he exclaims, "The time is come, the day draweth near: let not the buyer rejoice, nor the seller mourn: for wrath is upon all the multitude thereof. For *the seller shall not return to that which is sold*, although they (the buyer and seller) were yet alive."* Here, then, is a clear reference to the law, that in the year of jubilee every man should return to his own possession. "That which is sold," says the law, "shall remain in the hand of him that hath bought it until the year of jubilee: and in the jubilee it shall go out, and he (the seller) shall return unto his possession."† Ezekiel also, with reference to yet future times, speaking of the portion of land to be appropriated to the prince, writes,—“If he give a gift of his inheritance to one of his servants, then it shall be his to the year of liberty;‡ after which it shall return to the prince.”§

These incidental allusions by Ezekiel to the law of the jubilee clearly imply that he was addressing those who required no explanation of the nature of the law, and that the practice of buying and selling land by the years of the jubilee was then the common custom of the Jews, that is to say, before their captivity at Babylon. Whether, however, the remainder of the law, viz.—“ye shall return every man unto his family,” that is, every slave shall become free in the year of jubilee, was carried into effect, is a more doubtful matter. But if the reckoning of the year of the jubilee was thus preserved, so also, of course, must the reckoning of the Sabbatical years have been preserved, as the one was computed from the other. That the practice of buying and selling land by the years of the jubilee was also in operation after the return from captivity, even till after the Christian era, appears from Josephus, who, speaking of the jubilee, writes, “This year also restores the land to its former possessors in the following manner:—When the jubilee is come, which name denotes liberty, he that sold the land, and he that bought it, meet together and make an

* Ezek. vii. 12.

† Lev. xxv. 13, 28.

‡ Called year of liberty because every slave became free in the year of Jubilee.

§ Ezek. xlv. 17.

Sabbatical Years and Jubilees.

B.C.			
9	15	Jotham.	
8	16		
7	1	Ahaz.	
6	2		
5	3		Ahaz sends messengers to Tiglath Pileser.
4	4		
3	5		
2	6		
1	7		
710	8		272
9	9		
8	10		
7	11		
6	12		
5	13		
4	14		
3	15		
2	1	Hezekiah.	1 Sennacherib associated with Sargon, or Shalmanezzer.
1	2		2
700	3		282 3
9	4		4
8	5		5
7	6		6
6	7		7 Samaria taken by Shalmanezzer or Sargon.
5	8		8
4	9		9
3	10		10
2	11		11
1	12		12
690	13		292 13
9	14		14 Sickness of Hezekiah.*
8	15		15 Invasion of Sennacherib † 466
7	16		16 years 9 months before Pto-
6	17		17 lemy Philopator—February
5	18		18 688.
4	19		19 Sennacherib reigns alone.
3	20		20
2	21		21
1	22		22
680	23		302 1 Esarhaddon at Babylon.

* Sickness of Hezekiah towards the end of his thirteenth year, marked by an eclipse of the sun 11th January, 689, affecting the dial of Ahaz.

† Sennacherib's invasion towards the end of the fourteenth year. Sabbatical year followed by a Jubilee. Isaiah, xxxvii. 30.

estimate, on one hand, of the fruits gathered, and, on the other hand, of the expenses laid out upon it. If the fruits gathered come to more than the expenses laid out, he that sold it takes the land again: but if the expense prove more than the fruits, the present possessor receives of the former owner the difference that was wanting, and leaves the land to him.* Josephus seems here to describe the practical working of the law. Philo also tells us that the fiftieth year was practically looked upon as a year of remission for slaves in his days.† It is clear, therefore, that both before and after the captivity a register of the years of jubilee was kept; and this is the opinion even of Maimonides, who tells us that the fiftieth year *was computed*, though not kept as a jubilee, as he believes, after the return from captivity.

But though the *reckoning* of the sabbatical years and jubilees was thus correctly preserved for the daily secular purposes of the conveyance and reconveyance of land, there is every reason to believe that before the captivity, that is, during the whole period of the monarchy, the command to abstain from cultivating the land every seventh year was by no means observed, but on the contrary most wilfully neglected, so that this neglect came to be treated as a national sin. It is from the recorded period of non-observance of these Sabbaths, and from the precise period of punishment inflicted in consequence, that we are enabled with much certainty to fix the actual dates at which these consecrated years of fallow ought to have been observed. That these years were not observed by ten out of the twelve tribes of Israel, viz.—those ten tribes who revolted under “Jeroboam, who made Israel to sin,” is made probable by the fact, that Jeroboam had instituted a feast in the eighth month ‡ at Samaria, with the implied object of preventing the observance of the feast of the seventh month at Jerusalem by those tribes; and we know that it was in the seventh month that the Sabbatical year began and ended, and

* Whiston's Josephus, Ant. iii. ch. xii. 3.

† Philo's Treatise on Festivals.

‡ 1 Kings, xii. 32.

Sabbatical Years and Jubilees.

B.C.			
9	24	Hezekiah.	2 Esarhaddon at Babylon.
8	25	Era of the Temple.	3
7	26		4
6	27		5
5	28		6
4	29		7
3	1		8
2	2		9
1	3		10
670	4		11
		312	Manassch carried captive to
9	5		Babylon.
8	6		12
7	7		13
6	8		
5	9		
4	10		
3	11		
2	12		
1	13		
660	14	322	
9	15		Tirhakah slays Necho.
8	16		
7	17		
6	18		
5	19		
4	20		Ephraim now broken, and "no
3	21		longer a people." Isa. vii. 8.
2	22		Commencement of the punish-
1	23		ment of Israel. Lev. xxvi. 17-
650	24	332	24.
9	25		
8	26		
7	27		
6	28		
5	29		
4	30		
3	31		
2	32		
1	33		
640	34	342	

* Gumpach makes the first year of Manasseh B.C. 674, but curtails his reign from 55 to 35 years, p. 176.

that the ceremony which connected together the Sabbatical year and the jubilee, viz.—the sounding of the trumpet of the jubilee—was to be performed. The sin of Jeroboam, and the waywardness of the ten tribes, is constantly referred to in Jewish history, and at length the period of their contumacy was summed up by Ezekiel as a period of 390 years,* to terminate, together with the forty years' contumacy of the house of Judah, in the final siege and destruction of Jerusalem, the holy city, the chosen metropolis of the twelve tribes of Israel. Accordingly we find that this was the exact number of the years which elapsed from the first year of Jeroboam to the year of the destruction of the city by Nebuchadnezzar, as laid down in the accompanying table. There is the best reason also for believing that the national observance of the consecrated seventh year, by abstaining from the cultivation of the land, was neglected by the tribes of Judah and Benjamin, from the reign of Solomon to the same time, from the fact that the captivity at Babylon was to last for exactly seventy years, that the land might enjoy her seventy Sabbaths.† So that, taking the twelfth year of Solomon, or the year of the dedication of the temple of Jerusalem, as the exact time of the establishment of the Jewish polity in the Holy Land, as contemplated by Moses,‡ and as the year in which Jerusalem “the holy city,” was thus selected as “the city which the Lord had chosen out of all the tribes of Israel to put his name there,”§ and in which city from thenceforth all the feasts and ceremonies of the law were commanded to be observed,¶ and specially the ordinances connected with the three great feasts, including the feast of the seventh month,—counting, we say, from the twelfth of Solomon to the year of the destruction of Jerusalem, there appear to have been exactly 420 years, during which this peculiar and re-

* Ezek. iv. 5.

† 2 Chron. xxxvi. 21.

‡ “Since the day that I brought forth my people Israel out of Egypt, I chose no city out of all the tribes of Israel to build an house, that my name might be therein.” Solomon refers to these words at the time of the dedication. 1 Kings, viii. 16.

§ 2 Chron. xii. 13.

¶ Deut. xvi. 2, 15, 16; xxxi. 11.

Sabbatical Years and Jubilees.

B.C.

9	35	Manasseh.	
8	36		
7	37		
6	38		
5	39		
4	40		
3	41		
2	42		
1	43		
630	44		352
9	45		
8	46		
7	47		
6	48		
5	49		1 Nabopalassar, or Nabuchodo-
4	50		2 nosor.
3	51		3
2	52		4
1	53		5
620	54		362 6
9	55		7
8	1 Amon.		8
7	2		9
6	1 Josiah.		10 Ashdod taken by Psammeti-
5	2		11 chus.
4	3		12 Phraortes or Arphaxad slain.
3	4		13
2	5		14
1	6		15
610	7		372 16 The Scythians enter Asia.
9	8		17 Judith and Holophernes.
8	9		18 Ashdod threatened by the Scy-
7	10		19 thians.
6	11		20
5	12		21
4	13		Jeremiah begins to preach the law.
3	14		
2	15		
1	16		
600	17		382

markable ordinance, the Sabbatical year, had been nationally neglected by the Jewish people.

Nevertheless, as we have said, the register of these consecrated years was correctly preserved; and it is the register or calendar of Sabbatical years, which we desire to recover, as a test of the accuracy of our chronological reckoning.

The first question to be considered is, were these Sabbatical years reckoned in continuous and unbroken series? for if so, we may obtain the dates of the whole series by fixing the date of any one of them.

The learned Rabbi, Maimonides,* one of the most distinguished of Jewish writers, following the author of the *Seder Olam Rabbah*,† or Great Chronicle of the Jews, has maintained that the series of Sabbatical years, before the captivity, was broken by the intercalation of the year of Jubilee every fiftieth year; and this is the conclusion arrived at by many, and is indeed the opinion of the most recent writer on the subject, on a review of the whole question.‡ But it will presently be seen,—and Maimonides himself does not dispute the fact,—that after the captivity, the Sabbatical years were observed in continuous septennial series, down to the time of the destruction of the second temple, and they are so even down to the present day. So that according to this opinion, the law of Moses regarding the Sabbatical year was interpreted in one way by Joshua and the Jews who were instructed by Moses down to the time of the captivity, and in another way by Ezra and the great Synagogue after the captivity, a notion which on the face of it is highly improbable. Nor, indeed, is this idea acquiesced in by other Jewish writers. R. Jehuda, and the Geonim, or heads of the Jewish academies in Babylonia, from the seventh to the eleventh centuries, maintained that the year of Jubilee recurred every forty-ninth year, so also do Scaliger, Petavius, Cunæus,§ Pontanus,|| Spanheim,¶

* Maimonides, ch. x. de Shemitha et Jubilæo.

† *Seder Olam Rabbah*, compare ch. xi. with ch. xv. Chron. Trans. vol. ii. Part ii.

‡ See Smith's Dictionary of the Bible, *voce* Jubilee.

§ *Critici Sacri*, vol. vi.

|| Pontanus de Sab. Ann.

¶ Spanheim, Chron. et Hist. Sac. p. 38.

Sabbatical Years and Jubilees.

B.C.		
9	18 Josiah.	Great Reformation.
8	19	
7	20	
6	21	
5	22	
4	23	
3	24	
2	25	
1	26	
590	27	392
9	28	
8	29	
7	30	
6	31 Jehoahaz.	
5	1 Jehoiakim.	Eclipse of Thales,* 28th May.
4	2	
3	3	Destruction of Nineveh.
2	4	Battle of Carchemish.
1	5	1 Nebuchadnezzar.
580	6	402 2
9	7	3
8	8	4
7	9	5
6	10	6
5	11	7
4	1 Jechoniah.	8 Daniel carried to Babylon.
3	1 Zedekiah.	9
2	2	10
1	3	11
570	4	412 12
9	5	13
8	6	14
7	7	15
6	8	16
5	9	17
4	10	18
3	11	19 Burning of Jerusalem in the
2		420 20 420th year of Solomon's
1	Captivity.†	21 Temple. [away. Jer. lii. 30.
560		2 22 Last body of captives carried

* See Jer. x. 2.

† The first year of the captivity began in B.C. 562, and ended in 561.

and our own Archbishop Ussher. Let us appeal from Rabbi Maimonides to that far more ancient and most eminent Rabbi, whom we have just named, whose authority on the subject of Levitical law, if we can ascertain it, is not to be called in question.

Ezra, "the ready scribe in the law of Moses," "a scribe of the words of the commandment of the Lord, and of his statutes to Israel,"* returned from captivity at Babylon, commissioned by the King of Persia to re-establish in Jerusalem the forms and ceremonies of the Jewish church, and to re-organise the nation by setting magistrates and judges over the people, with power to execute judgment, whether unto death, or to banishment, or to confiscation of goods, upon those who disobeyed the law of God and the king.† Now this Ezra, as Maimonides observes,‡ reinstituted the observance of the Sabbatical year. For the princes, Levites, and priests, entered into a covenant at his command, amongst other things, that they "would leave the seventh year (that is to say, cease from cultivating the land in that year) and the exaction of every debt," that is in the year of release,§ and from this time forward to the time of the destruction of the second temple, the religious observance of the law was strictly fulfilled. Ezra, we assume, had a distinct and accurate conception of what was commanded in the law—of how it had been neglected by the Jews in the times of the monarchy, and how, in obedience to the law, it ought to be observed for the future; and in the last chapter of the second book of Chronicles, which was undoubtedly written by him, he records his opinion. When speaking of the siege and capture of Jerusalem by the Chaldeans, he writes: "They burnt the house of God, and brake down the wall of Jerusalem, and burnt all the palaces thereof; and them which had escaped from the sword carried he away to

* Ezra, vii. 26.

† Ezra, vii. 6-11.

‡ Maimonides, and the Jewish writers in general, state that this return of Ezra was in the seventh year of the second temple, which we shall hereafter show to be correct. He returned before the high-priesthood of Eliashib. Ezra, x. 6-18.

§ Neh. x. 31.

Sabbatical Years and Jubilees.

B.C.			
9	Captivity at	3	23 Nebuchadnezzar.
8	Babylon.	4	24
7		5	25
6		6	26
5	70 years' deso-	7	27
4	lation of Je-	8	28
3	rusalem.	9	29
2	Dan. ix. 1.	10	30
1		11	31
550		12	32
9		13	33
8	During which	14	34
7	the land en-	15	35
6	joyed her	16	36
5	Sabbaths.	17	37
4		18	38
3		19	39
2		20	40
1		21	41
540		22	42
9	" For as long	23	43
8	as she lay	24	Ahasuerus.
7	desolateshe	25	
6	kept Sab-	26	
5	bath to ful-	27	
4	fil three-	28	
3	score and	29	
2	ten years."	30	Esther, Hadassah, or 'Atossa,
1	2 Chron.	31	marries Cyaxares, or Ahasue-
530	xxxvi. 21.	32	rus.
9		33	
8		34	
7		35	
6		36	
5		37	
4		38	
3		39	
2		40	
1		41	Darius, adopted son of Ahasuerus,
520		42	or Cyaxares, marries 'Atossa.

Babylon, where they were servants to him (Nebuchadnezzar) and his sons until the reign of the kingdom of Persia.”* He then concludes with this remarkable reference to the Sabbatical years, “to fulfil the Word of the Lord by the mouth of Jeremiah, until the *land had enjoyed her Sabbaths*: for, as long as she lay desolate, she kept Sabbath, to fulfil threescore and ten years.”

These words were written by Ezra when the Jews were again settled in Judæa, after their return from captivity, and when the seventy years’ desolation of the land was looked back upon as an event past and fulfilled. There could be no doubt or misunderstanding, at that time, in the minds of Ezra and his contemporaries, after the event, as to the particular mode in which “the word of the Lord by the mouth of Jeremiah” had been accomplished: and Ezra accordingly has, in the above words, counted the period without ambiguity from the date of the burning of the temple to the reign of the Persians at Babylon.

Jeremiah had declared, in the fourth year of Jehoiakim, “This whole land shall be a desolation and an astonishment: and these nations shall serve the king of Babylon seventy years.”† He made no allusion, however, to the special reason referred to by Ezra, viz.—the long neglect of the septennial rests commanded by Moses, amongst other transgressions, why the period of punishment on the nation was measured out, as neither more nor less than threescore and ten years; nor did he define beforehand the particular event which should mark either the beginning or ending of the period. There had been much doubt and perplexity, we may assume, amongst the captives at Babylon as to the exact time when the term of their exile would cease. Some undoubtedly had counted the years from the fourth year of Jehoiakim, when the first invasion of the king of Babylon took place, and when Judæa first became a province of that kingdom, and had fondly hoped that the decree of Cyrus would have marked the

* That is, till the reign of the Persians at Babylon towards the end of the reign of Darius son of Hystaspes.

† Jer. xxv. 11.

Sabbatical Years and Jubilees.

B.C.		
9	Captivity at	43
8	Babylon.	44
7		45
6		46
5		47
4	70 years' de-	48
3	solation of	49
2	Jerusalem.	50
1		51
510		52
9		53
8		54
7		55
6		56
5		57
4		58
3		59
2		60
1		61
500		62
9		63
8		64
7		65
6		66
5		67
4		68
3	Darius.	69
2	1	70
1	2	
490	3	
9	4	29
8	5	30
7	6	31 Temple finished.†
6	Xerxes.§	32 Temple dedicated. {
5	1	Darius and Xerxes, being kings of Persia. Ezra, vi. 14.
4	2	33
3	3	34
2	4	35
1	5	36 Darius dies at the age of 72.—
480	6	Otesias.

* Ezra, iv. 6.

† Daniel, v. 31.

‡ Temple finished in the twelfth month (Adar) of the sixth year of Darius, Ezra, vi. 15, Josephus says the ninth year. Probably the fittings and decorations were not complete till that time. The dedication probably did not take place till many months after it was finished, as with the temple of Solomon.

§ Called Artaxerxes by Daniel and Ezra.

completion of their servitude, and desolation of the land. Others, with the prophet Ezekiel, had begun to count their seventy years from the captivity of Jechoniah, eight years later. But, when it was seen that the decree of Cyrus was set at nought by the local governors, and had become of no effect,—that the holy Temple of Jerusalem still remained cast down to the ground,—that the same desolation continued to reign throughout the land,—and also that the termination of the years counted from the captivity of Jechoniah had failed to bring relief,—there remained so much doubt and despondency in the minds of the people as to the predicted time of their restoration, that even in the very year when their term of punishment was accomplished, as if in despair, we read in the prophet Haggai concerning them, “This people say, The time is not come, the time when the Lord’s house should be built.”*

In the first year, however, of Darius the Mede, the full term of seventy years’ desolation of the city and Temple was on the point of completion; and both Daniel and Ezra, whose minds were intent upon the restoration of the holy city and sanctuary, perceived that the words of Jeremiah were now about to be accomplished. For the first time, also, the true import of the term of seventy years of desolation seems to have been apprehended. They have both fallen into the same train of reflection concerning the mode and meaning of that period, and have both expressed themselves almost in the same words. Daniel, pondering over the words of Jeremiah, pronounces that the period of seventy years’ desolation spoken of by that prophet had reference to the “desolations of Jerusalem.”† Ezra, referring to the same words of Jeremiah, computes the period as threescore and ten years from the burning of the city by the Chaldeans, which is precisely the same mode of interpretation. The heavenly messenger sent to Daniel, in the first year of Darius the Mede, proclaims, “Seventy weeks” of years, or 490 years, “are determined upon thy people, and upon thy holy city, to finish

* Hag. i. 2.

† Dan. ix. 2.

Sabbatical Years and Jubilees.

B.C.			
9		7 Xerxes, called	Ezra comes to Jerusalem and enforces the observance of the Sabbatical year.*
8	■	8 Artaxerxes by	
7		9 Ezra.	
6		10	
5		11	
4		12	
3		13	
2		14	
1	■	15	
470		16	
9		17	Artaxerxes Longim ^a .
8		18	
7		19	
6		20	
5	■	21	
4		1	
3		2	
2		3	
1		4	
460		5	
9		6	
8	■	7	
7		8	
6		9	
5		10	
4		11	
3		12	
2		13	
1	■	14	
450		15	
9		16	
8		17	
7		18	
6		19	
5		20	
4	■	21	
3		22	
2		23	
1		24	
440		25	

* "Upon the death of Darius, Xerxes his son took the kingdom. There was now in Babylon a righteous man" . . . "he was principal priest of the people, and his name was Esdras."—Josephus, Ant., xi. 5, 1.

the transgression," &c.; * Ezra, dwelling upon the same idea, relates historically, how on the expiration of threescore and ten years counted from the burning of the city, which confessedly must have ended in the reign of Darius, son of Hystaspes, the land had enjoyed her full complement of threescore and ten Sabbaths, or Sabbatical years, which is only another mode of expressing, that seventy weeks of years were now accomplished, according to the calendar of consecrated years. The idea intended to be conveyed by both those sacred writers was, that, simultaneously with the completion of the seventy years' desolation of the city, a great epoch in the history of the Jewish Church had been arrived at, by the completion of seventy Sabbatical weeks of years, upon the holy city, and the holy land; and Daniel shows that these years were fulfilled about the first or second year of Darius.

With regard to the king here referred to under the title of Darius, if any further and decisive proof were required that both Daniel and Ezra were speaking of one and the same king, viz.—Darius, son of Hystaspes,—it is embodied in the fact, that the very same term of seventy years, counted from the same point, viz. the destruction of the holy city and temple, is reckoned by Daniel as ending in the reign of Darius the Mede, by Ezra as ending in the reign of Darius, son of Hystaspes.

Yet it is remarkable that many of the most able commentators on this portion of sacred history, constrained and fettered by the conventional dates of heathen chronology, and following the hasty suggestion of Josephus, with a view to the adjustment of that chronology to Scripture, have been willing to believe that the king known to Daniel, only by the title of Darius, was no other than Cyaxares, son of Astyages, king of Media, who died before Darius, son of Hystaspes, had come to the throne: the result of which is, to set aside the concurrent testimony of four contemporaneous sacred writers, who have all placed the termination of the seventy years in the reign of the son of Hystaspes, and not earlier than that reign.

* Dan. ix. 24.

Sabbatical Years and Jubilees.

B.C.			
9	26	Artaxerxes	[December.*
8	27	Longim*.	Wall of Jerusalem completed in
7	28		Dedication with trumpets in the
6	29		year of Jubilee.
5	30		
4	31		
3	32		Nehemiah returns to Susa.
2	33		
1	34		
430	35		
9	36		
8	37		
7	38		
6	39		
5	40		
4	41		
3	1	Darius Nothus.	
2	2		
1	3		
420	4		
9	5		
8	6		
7	7		
6	8		
5	9		
4	10		
3	11		
2	12		
1	13		
410	14		
9	15		
8	16		
7	17		
6	18		
5	19		
4	1	Artaxerxes	
3	2	Mnemon.	
2	3		
1	4		
400	5		

* "And this trouble he (Nehemiah) underwent for two years and four months, for in so long a time was the wall built, in the twenty-eighth year of the reign of Xerxes (Artaxerxes) in the ninth month."—Josephus, Ant. xi. 5, 6.

FIRST PERIOD OF THE JEWISH CHURCH,
COMPRISING 490 YEARS.

- B.C.**
1471 Mission of Moses, in the spring, say 12 months before the exodus.
1470 Exodus, in the month Abib, or Nisan.
1430 Entry into Canaan, in the month Nisan.
1423 Division of the land, say in the month Tisri, 7½ years after the entry.
1417-6 The first Sabbatical year after the division of the land.

Calendar of Sabbatical years and Jubilees.

B.C.	1417-6	1368-7	1319-8
	1410-9	1361-0	1312-1
	1403-2	1354-3	1305-4
	1396-5	1347-6	1298-7
	1389-8	1340-9	1291-0
	1382-1	1333-2	1284-3
	1375-4	1326-5	1277-6
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
1st Jubilee	1374-3	2nd Jubilee 1325-4	3rd Jubilee 1276-5
	1270-9	1221-0	1172-1
	1263-2	1214-3	1165-4
	1256-5	1207-6	1158-7
	1249-8	1200-9	1151-0
	1242-1	1193-2	1143-2
	1235-4	1186-5	1137-6
	1228-7	1179-8	1130-9
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
4th Jubilee	1227-6	5th Jubilee 1178-7	6th Jubilee 1129-8
	1123-2	1074-3	1025-4
	1116-5	1067-6	1018-7
	1109-8	1060-9	1011-0
	1102-1	1053-2	1004-3
	1095-4	1046-5	997-6
	1088-7	1039-8	990-9
	1081-0	1032-1	983-2
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
7th Jubilee	1080-9	8th Jubilee 1031-0	9th Jubilee 982-1

SECOND PERIOD OF THE JEWISH CHURCH,
COMPRISING 490 YEARS.

SEVENTY WEEKS, OR TEN JUBILEES, FROM THE DEDICATION OF THE
TEMPLE IN B.C. 982, TO THE RETURN FROM CAPTIVITY IN
B.C. 492.

Calendar of Sabbatical years and Jubilees.

B.C.	976-5	927-6	878-7
	969-8	920-9	871-0
	962-1	913-2	864-3
	955-4	906-5	857-6
	948-7	899-8	850-9
	941-0	892-1	843-2
	934-3	885-4	836-5
<hr/>			
1st Jubilee	933-2	2nd Jubilee 884-3	3rd Jubilee 835-4
	829-8	780-9	731-0
	822-1	773-2	724-3
	815-4	766-5	717-6
	808-7	759-8	710-9
	801-0	752-1	703-2
	794-3	745-4	696-5
	787-6	738-7	689-8
<hr/>			
4th Jubilee	786-5	5th Jubilee 737-6	6th Jubilee 688-7
	682-1	633-2	584-3
	675-4	626-5	577-6
	668-7	619-8	570-9
	661-0	612-1	563-2
	654-3	605-4	556-5
	647-6	598-7	549-8
	640-9	591-0	542-1
<hr/>			
7th Ju.	639-8	8th Ju. 590-9	9th Ju. 541-2
			10th Ju. 492-1

Return of the Jews from Babylon in B.C. 492, when Darius, in his 2nd year, was about 63 years of age. Dan. v. 31; Zech. ii. 7.

**THIRD PERIOD OF THE JEWISH CHURCH,
COMPRISING 490 YEARS.**

- B.C.**
491 Building of the second Temple commenced.
486 Temple finished in the sixth year of Darius.
486 Temple dedicated in the autumn.
479-8 First Sabbatical year under the second Temple.

Calendar of Sabbatical years and Jubilees.

B.C. 479-8
472-1
465-4
458-7
451-0
444-3
437-6

First year of Jubilee 436-5 after "seven weeks" of years,
ending with the dedication of the wall of Jerusalem.

Period of " threescore and two weeks "
" unto Messiah the Prince."

B.C. 430-9	290-9	150-9
423-2	283-2	143-2
416-5	276-5	136-5
409-8	269-8	129-8
402-1	262-1	122-1
395-4	255-4	115-4
388-7	248-7	108-7
381-0	241-0	101-0
374-3	234-3	94-3
367-6	227-6	87-6
360-9	220-9	80-9
353-2	213-2	73-2
346-5	206-5	66-5
339-8	199-8	59-8
332-1	192-1	52-1
325-4	185-4	45-4
318-7	178-7	38-7
311-0	171-0	31-0
304-3	164-3	24-3
297-6	157-6	17-6
		10-9

Birth of Christ 3-2

Sabbatical Years and Jubilees.

B.C.		
399	6	Artaxerxes
8	7	Mnemon.
7	8	
6	9	
5	10	
4	11	
3	12	
2	13	
1	14	
390	15	
9	16	
8	17	
7	18	
6	19	
5	20	
4	21	
3	22	
2	23	
1	24	
380	25	
9	26	
8	27	
7	28	
6	29	
5	30	
4	31	
3	32	
2	33	
1	34	
370	35	
9	36	
8	37	
7	38	
6	39	
5	40	
4	41	
3	42	
2	43	
1	44	
360	45	

The testimony of Scripture to this effect is so clear and invariable, that it is difficult to understand how it could ever have been misapprehended. The prophet Zechariah, who was living at Jerusalem at the expiration of the seventy years, writes, in the eleventh month of the second year of Darius, son of Hystaspes, "O Lord of hosts, how long wilt thou not have mercy on Jerusalem, and on the cities of Judah, against which thou hast had indignation these threescore and ten years?"*

There can be no question that the years here referred to are the same threescore and ten years spoken of by Daniel and Ezra, as reckoned from the destruction of Jerusalem, and here declared to have ended in the second year of Darius. Again, two years later in the same reign, the same prophet relates how messengers had been sent to Jerusalem by the Jews still dwelling at Babylon, to inquire of the priests, now that the Temple was being rebuilt, whether they should continue to fast in the fifth month, in commemoration of the burning of the Temple, as they had done from year to year, *even "those seventy years:"*† thus again marking the time of the fulfilment of those years in the reign of Darius, son of Hystaspes.

Ezra, it is true, has related, how, with a view to the fulfilment of the word of the Lord by the mouth of Jeremiah, Cyrus, in his first year as king of Babylon, had been induced to issue a decree for the rebuilding of the Temple of Jerusalem; and many, no doubt, as before observed, trusted that the seventy years of servitude to the king of Babylon counted from the reign of Jehoiakim, were then about to cease. But Ezra must not be interpreted as contradicting himself. He does not say that the seventy years were fulfilled in the reign of Cyrus: but having just before laid down that the seventy years of desolation and servitude were to be computed from the burning of the city and Temple, he goes on to relate, how the decree of Cyrus remained without operation, even "unto the second year of Darius."‡ That the servitude at Babylon

* Zech. i. 12.

† Zech. vii. 5.

‡ Ezra, iv. 24.

Sabbatical Years and Jubilees.

B. C.		
359	■	1 Ochus.
8		2
7		3
6		4
5		5
4		6
3		7
2	■	8
1		9
350		10
9		11
8		12
7		13
6	■	14
5		15
4		16
3		17
2		18
1		19
340		20
9	■	21
8		1 Arces.
7		2
6		1 Darius Codo-
5		2 manus.
4		3
3		4
2		5
1	■	1 Alexander the
330		2 Great.
9		3
8		4
7		5
6		6
5	■	7
4		8
3		1 Ptolemy Soter.
3		2
1		3
320		4

did actually continue till that very year, we also learn from Zechariah, who, in the second year of Darius, writes, "Ho, ho, come forth, and flee from the land of the north, saith the Lord *Deliver thyself, O Zion, that dwellest with the daughter of Babylon.*"† So that Daniel, Zechariah, and Ezra, all concur in bringing the termination of the seventy years to the same date; while Haggai, writing at Jerusalem, in the ninth month of the second year of Darius, fixes, as it were, the very day of reconciliation between the people and their offended God. He writes, "Consider now from this day and upwards, from the four and twentieth day of the ninth month, even from the day that the foundation of the Lord's temple was laid, consider it. Is the seed yet in the barn? yea, as yet the vine, and the fig-tree, and the pomegranate, and the olive-tree, hath not brought forth; *from this day will I bless you.*"† And this period of reconciliation is also very clearly referred to by Zechariah, who, in the second year of Darius, writes, "Thus saith the Lord, I am returned to Jerusalem with mercies." . . . "Sing and rejoice, O daughter of Zion: for, lo, I come, and I will dwell in the midst of thee, saith the Lord." . . . "The Lord shall inherit Judah his portion in the holy land, and shall choose Jerusalem again." . . . "As I thought to punish you when your fathers provoked me to wrath, saith the Lord of hosts, and I repented not: so again have I thought *in these days* to do well unto Jerusalem, and to the house of Judah."‡ Unquestionably, therefore, the seventy years' desolation of Jerusalem, and the "threescore and ten" sabbaths fulfilled during the desolation, were completed in the second year of the reign of Darius, son of Hystaspes.

But as, in common parlance, when we speak of seventy Sabbath days as past, we imply the fulfilment of seventy weeks of days, so when Ezra speaks of seventy Sabbatical years fulfilled, he implies the fulfilment of seventy weeks of years, or 490 years, of which 420 years should be accounted as ordinary years, and the remaining seventy years as Sab-

* Zech. ii. 6, 7. † Hag. ii. 18, 19. ‡ Zech. i. 16; ii. 10, 12; viii. 3, 14, 15.

Sabbatical Years and Jubilees.

B.C.		
319	5	Ptolemy Soter.
8	6	
7	7	
6	8	
5	9	
4	10	
3	11	
2	12	
1	13	
310	14	
9	15	
8	16	
7	17	
6	18	
5	19	
4	20	
3	21	
2	22	
1	23	
300	24	
9	25	
8	26	
7	27	
6	28	
5	29	
4	30	
3	31	
2	32	
1	33	
290	34	
9	35	
8	36	
7	37	
6	38	
5	1	Ptolemy Phi-
4	2	ladelphus.
3	3	
2	4	
1	5	
280	6	

baths. Now we have already observed, that counting from the twelfth year of Solomon, when the dedication of the first Temple took place, and Jerusalem was thereby consecrated the "holy city," to the last year of Zedekiah, when the holy city and Temple were destroyed, was a period of exactly 420 years, as set down in the accompanying table; which, added to the "threescore and ten years" of penitential Sabbaths enjoyed by the land, during its period of desolation, make up the period of "seventy weeks" of years spoken of in the book of Daniel, as determined or accomplished on the "holy city."

So that literally in this year, and not before, were accomplished the words, "Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people, and upon *thy holy city*, to finish the transgression, and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up the vision and prophecy (that is, of Jeremiah), and to anoint the holy of holies;" that is, to rebuild the Temple or sanctuary of Jerusalem. But, again, if seventy weeks of years, each with its appointed Sabbath, were exactly fulfilled, neither more nor less, according to the calendar, in the second year of Darius, then must that second year of Darius have been a Sabbatical year, and so have been set down in that calendar.

Lastly, if Darius, the son of Hystaspes, was the same as Darius the Mede,—a fact which we consider to have been now indisputably established,—then was this second year of the reign of Darius, that is, his second year computed from the time when he was "set over the realm of the Chaldeans," concurrent with the sixty-third year of his age, that is, with the year B.C. 492; and this year, B.C. 492, ought to fall within the regular series of Sabbatical years, which is the point we have been aiming to arrive at.

Let us now recapitulate the several points which have been established in the foregoing remarks. We have ascertained,—

1st. That a calendar of Sabbatical years and Jubilees was preserved, and made use of in the ordinary transactions of purchase and sale of land, before the time of the captivity.

Sabbatical Years and Jubilees.

B.C.		
279	7	Ptolemy Phi-
8	8	ladelphus.
7	9	
6	10	
5	11	
4	12	
3	13	
2	14	
1	15	
270	16	
9	17	
8	18	
7	19	
6	20	
5	21	
4	22	
3	23	
2	24	
1	25	
260	26	
9	27	
8	28	
7	29	
6	30	
5	31	
4	32	
3	33	
2	34	
1	35	
250	36	
9	37	
8	38	Ptolemy Euer-
7	1	getes.
6	2	
5	3	
4	4	
3	5	
2	6	
1	7	
240	8	

2d. That seventy weeks of years, as computed in this calendar, were completed on the "holy city," Jerusalem, in the last year of the captivity.

3d. That these seventy weeks of years were counted from the consecration of Jerusalem in the twelfth year of Solomon.

4th. That the seventieth, or last year of the captivity was Sabbatical.

5th. That this last year of the captivity was commensurate with the second year of Darius son of Hystaspes, reckoned from the time when he was "set over the realm of the Chaldeans."

6th. That this year was B.C. 492.

7th. That seventy weeks of years as then computed, comprised a period of exactly 490 years, not 500 years, and that the year of Jubilee, therefore, was not intercalated every fiftieth year, as suggested by Maimonides.

Having thus ascertained that the Sabbatical years, before the times of the captivity, were reckoned in continuous and unbroken series, in the same manner as we shall find that they were reckoned after the return from captivity; and having also fixed the exact date of one year in the series, the restoration of the whole calendar of consecrated years, from the time of the division of the land of Canaan by Joshua, when the computation commenced, to the birth of Christ, is a matter of simple enumeration. The following is the remarkable result, showing that the whole period of existence of the Jewish church, from the mission of Moses to the birth of Christ, is divided into three exact and equal cycles of 490 years each, or seventy weeks, or ten complete Jubilaic periods of forty-nine years.

The first period is counted from the year B.C. 1471, when Moses released the Jews from bondage in Egypt, and when they were first selected as God's chosen people, to the dedication of the temple of Solomon in B.C. 982, when the Jewish polity, as shadowed forth by Moses, was first established in the place which the Lord had chosen to put his name there.

Sabbatical Years and Jubilees.

B.C.

239	9	Ptolemy Euergetes.	
8	10		
7	11		
6	12		
5	13		
4	14		
3	15		
2	16		
1	17		
230	18		
9	19		
8	20		
7	21		
6	22		
5	23		
4	24		
3	25		
2	1	Ptolemy Philopator.	Capture of Samaria, Sennacherib's invasion, and fall of Jerusalem, calculated by Demetrius from Philopator. See p. 240.
1	2		
220	3		
9	4		
8	5		
7	6		
6	7		
5	8		
4	9		
3	10		
2	11		
1	12		
210	13		
9	14		
8	15		
7	16		
6	17		
5	1	Ptolemy Epiphanes.	
4	2		
3	3		
2	4		
1	5		
200	6		

The second period is counted from the dedication of Solomon's Temple to the release of the Jews from the seventy years' bondage at Babylon, in B.C. 492.

The third is counted from B.C. 492 to the birth of Christ, B.C. 3-2, and comprises the minor period of 483 years, or "seven weeks and threescore and two weeks," "from the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem unto Messiah the prince," that is to say, of one period of jubilee, and sixty-two Sabbatical weeks of the sacred calendar, counted from the dedication of the second Temple in B.C. 486, or seventh year of Darius, when the Jewish laws and institutions were re-established, and from thenceforth observed, in a much more strict and perfect manner than had ever been effected in the days of the monarchy.

This is indeed a striking and remarkable result of our mode of reckoning Hebrew chronology, and leads to many serious reflections, into which this is not the fitting place to enter. We shall return again to the consideration of these three successive cycles of 490 years in our chronological sketch of Jewish history.

We now propose to verify, by direct historical testimony, the exactness of the dates of several years set down in the calendar as Sabbatical, both before and after the captivity, and so to establish beyond question the soundness of the principle adopted of continuous septennial division without intercalation. At the same time verifying, by the same direct testimony, the exact date of one single year of jubilee, we shall show how the whole series of Sabbaths, from the time of Joshua to the building of the second temple, divides itself into periods of forty-nine years each, or seven weeks of years.

Nothing can be more certain than that the Jews religiously observed the consecrated years of rest after their return from captivity at Babylon. Long exile and affliction in the land of their enemies, in strict fulfilment of the words of their prophets, had left an impression on the mind of the nation never to be effaced, of the nearness and reality of the divine hand which directed their destinies, and a great and permanent change had

Sabbatical Years and Jubilees.

B.C.			
199		7	Ptolemy Epi-
8	■	8	phanes.
7		9	
6		10	
5		11	
4		12	
3		13	
2		14	
1	■	15	
190		16	
9		17	
8		18	
7		19	
6		20	
5	■	21	
4	■	22	
3		23	
2		24	
1		1	Ptolemy Phi-
180			lometor.
9			
8	■		
7			
6			
5		1	Antiochus Epi-
4		2	phanes.
3		3	
2		4	
1	■	5	
170		6	
9		7	
8		8	
7		9	
6		10	
5		11	
4	■	1	Antiochus Eu-
3	■	2	pator.
2		1	Judas Macca-
1		2	beus.
160		3	

Siege of Jerusalem in the Sab-
batical year.*

* Jos. Ant. xii, 9, 3-5.

thus been wrought in the character of the whole people. As the times of the first temple and of the monarchy had been marked by long periods of perverseness and neglect of the law of Moses, and by a weak and wavering belief, more frequently tending towards the idolatries of the surrounding nations than to the worship of the one only God; so were the times of the duration of the second temple, from its restoration under Darius to its final destruction by Titus, characterised by extraordinary firmness and sincerity of faith, accompanied by a Pharisaical adherence to the strictest letter of the law. The observance of the Sabbath day was henceforth fenced in with restrictions of the minutest character, as regarded Sabbath journeys, Sabbath burdens, and the performance of household duties on that day of rest; while from the strict abstinence from cultivation of the land in the seventh year, the nation appears upon more than one occasion to have fallen into grievous straits for want of the necessities of life, when suffering under the calamity of siege or invasion from their enemies.

The first well-established date of a Sabbatical year actually observed by the Jews, to which we shall refer, is the year of the siege and taking of Jerusalem by Herod the Great. Josephus tells us that this event happened in the year when Marcus Agrippa and Caninius Gallus were Consuls at Rome,* which year, by reference to a table of Consuls, we find to be the year B.C. 37. Josephus relates that the misery of the Jews was greatly increased towards the end of the siege, by the presence of the Sabbatical year, "which," to use his own words, "*was going on, ἐνειστήκει*, and forced the country to lie still uncultivated, since we are forbidden," he says, "to sow the land in that year."† This expression, "*was going on*," clearly indicates that the time spoken of was the second of the two Julian years covered by a Sabbatical year, for the Sabbatical year commenced in the seventh month, and extended from autumn in one year to autumn in the next. So that the year B.C. 38-7, that is, from seed-time in B.C. 38, to seed-time in

* Jos. Ant. xiv. 16, 4.

† Jos. Ant. xv. 1. 1, 2.

Sabbatical Years and Jubilees.

B.C.			
159		4	Judas Macca-
8		5	beus.
7	■	6	
6	■	7	
5		8	
4		9	
3		10	
2		1	Jonathan.
1		2	
150	■	3	
9	■	4	
8		5	
7		6	
6		7	
5		8	
4		9	
3	■	1	Simon.
2	■	2	
1		3	
140		4	
9		5	
8		6	
7		7	
6	■	8	
5	■	1	John Hyrcanus.
4		2	Siege of Jericho in the Sabbatical year.*
3		3	
2		4	
1		5	
130		6	
9	■	7	
8	■	8	
7		9	
6		10	
5		11	
4		12	
3		13	
2	■	14	
1	■	15	
120		16	

* Jos. Ant. xiii. 8. 1.

B.C. 37, was Sabbatical, as set down in the calendar of consecrated years.

A second date of a Sabbatical year may be equally well established, viz., the year in which the high-priest Simon was slain, and his son John Hyrcanus took the high-priesthood. This event is placed by the writer of the first book of Maccabees in the 177th year of the Seleucidæ,* that is, the year B.C. 136, and we know that the year of the event spoken of was the first of the two Julian years covered by a Sabbatical year, because Josephus, referring to the same event, writes, that while John Hyrcanus in his first year was carrying on the siege of the fortress of Jericho, "that year on which the Jews are used to rest *came on, ἐνέσταναι*; for the Jews," he says, "observe this rest every seventh year, as they do every seventh day."† The expression, "came on," is very distinct, as marking the first of the two Julian years, so that the year B.C. 136-5, or from seed-time in B.C. 136, to seed-time in B.C. 135, was Sabbatical, and so it is set down in the calendar.

A third well-established Sabbatical year is the year of the accession of Antiochus Eupator to the throne of Syria, or the year following the death of Antiochus Epiphanes, when the city of Jerusalem was besieged. This year Josephus informs us was the 150th year of the Seleucidæ, that is, the year B.C. 163; and from the expression that the land "continued unsowed," after long continuation of the siege, we may infer that the year named was the second of the two Julian years covered by the Sabbatical year. Josephus writes, Antiochus "placed a garrison of his own in the city; but as for the temple of Jerusalem he lay a long time besieging it, while they within bravely defended it."—"But then their provisions failed them. What fruits of the ground they had laid up were spent, and the land not being ploughed that year continued unsowed, because it was the seventh year, in which by our laws we are obliged to let it lie uncultivated."‡ The year, therefore, B.C. 164-3, that is, from seed-time in B.C. 164 to

* 1 Macc. xvi. 14.

† Jos. Ant. xiii. 8, 1.

‡ Jos. Ant. xii. 9, 3-5.

Sabbatical Years and Jubilees.

B.C.		
119	17	John Hyrcanus
8	18	
7	19	
6	20	
5	21	
4	22	
3	23	
2	24	
1	25	
110	26	
9	27	
8	28	
7	29	
6	30	
5	1	Aristobulus.*
4	1	Alexander Jannæus
3	2	
2	3	
1	4	
100	5	
9	6	
8	7	
7	8	
6	9	
5	10	
4	11	
3	12	
2	13	
1	14	
90	15	
9	16	
8	17	
7	18	
6	19	
5	20	
4	21	
3	22	
2	23	
1	24	
80	25	

* Josephus fixes the reign of Aristobulus 481 years, (read 381 years) and 3 months after the return of the Jews from Babylon. $381 + 105 = \text{B.C. } 486$, the era of the second temple.—Ant. xiii. xi. 1. See p. 303.

seed-time in B.C. 163, was Sabbatical, as set down in the calendar. The three years thus recorded in history as Sabbatical all occur at intervals from each other divisible into seven years, and are also all in septennial series counting from the Sabbatical year B.C. 492, already fixed; thus proving that the intercalation of the year of Jubilee after the 49th year was not in practice during the time of the second temple.

Let us now go back to the times before the captivity, during which a remarkable instance of two fallow years in succession, which could only take place when the Sabbatical year was followed by a Jubilee, is referred to by the prophet Isaiah, the dates of which have been fixed with precision by Demetrius. That historian we have just seen informs us that Sennacherib the Assyrian king had carried away captives from Judea in Feb. B.C. 688, having invaded and ravaged the country, we may assume, in the previous year, B.C. 689, and from the prophet Isaiah we learn that the year of this invasion was the fourteenth year of the reign of Hezekiah, which is B.C. 689, according to our table. Now the year B.C. 689-8, that is, from seed-time in B.C. 689 to seed-time in B.C. 688, is set down as Sabbatical in our calendar, and moreover is followed by the year of Jubilee, B.C. 688-7, counting, as we shall presently see, in regular series of forty-nine years from the division of the land by Joshua. If then there be truth in our reckoning, the fourteenth and fifteenth years of the reign of Hezekiah must have been consecrated years of rest. Now on reference to the history of these two years as related by Isaiah, we have every reason to believe that the fourteenth year of Hezekiah was Sabbatical, and also that it was followed by a year of Jubilee. During the Sabbatical year it was commanded, "Thou shalt neither sow thy field nor prune thy vineyard: that which groweth of its own accord of thy harvest thou shalt not reap"—"the Sabbath of the land shall be meat for you." During the year of Jubilee it was commanded, "Thou shalt not sow, neither reap that which growth of itself"—"*ye shall eat the increase thereof out of the field.*" The meaning of the command is this: the owner of

Sabbatical Years and Jubilees.

No.		
79	26	John Hyrcanus
8	1	Hyrcanus II.
7	2	
6	3	
5	4	
4	5	
3	6	
2	7	
1	8	
70	9	
9	10	
8	11	
7	12	
6	1	Aristobulus II.
5	2	
4	3	
3	4	
2	5	
1	6	
60	7	
9	8	
8	9	
7	10	
6	11	
5	12	
4	13	
3	14	
2	15	
1	16	
50	17	
9	18	
8	19	
7	20	
6	21	
5	22	
4	23	
3	24	
2	25	
1	1	Antigonus.
40	2	

Jerusalem taken by Pompey.

the soil shall not be at liberty, during the years of rest, to carry out of the field and appropriate to himself the produce of the soil; but the spontaneous products of the soil shall be open to all, to gather *and eat in the field*. The presence of Sennacherib's hostile army about Jerusalem, of course, would have prevented the gathering of the fruits of the field; and with reference, therefore, to his threatened attack on that city, Isaiah declares, "He shall not come into this city, nor shoot an arrow there, nor come before it with shield," &c.—"and this shall be a sign unto you," that is, a proof to you that Sennacherib *shall not come near the city*. "Ye shall eat this year,"—the fourteenth of Hezekiah,—"*such things as grow of themselves, and in the second year that which springeth of the same; and in the third year sow ye, and reap, and plant vineyards, and eat the fruits thereof.*"* It has been suggested by some, in explanation of this passage, that the presence of Sennacherib's army near Jerusalem would have prevented the cultivation of the land for two successive years, thus compelling the people to subsist on the spontaneous products of the land for that space of time; and that no reference, therefore, is here made to the appointed years of fallow. But this occupation of the land for two years by the invading army does not well accord with the sudden destruction of that army spoken of in the fourteenth year;† nor can it be explained how the forced fallow of the land for two years could be construed into a sign that Sennacherib's army should *not* approach Jerusalem. On the other hand, it is obvious that the prophet makes use of the very words which, in the book of Leviticus, are applied to the Sabbatical year, and to the Jubilee, or year of liberty—words needing no explanation to his hearers in the presence of those two consecrated years; and it is clear that the eating of the spontaneous products of the soil could only verify the prediction of the prophet, by their being gathered and eaten *in the field* by the people, regardless of the threats of siege, and by their so fulfilling the appointed duties of the

* 2 Kings, xix. 29; Isa. xxxvii. 30.

† According to the annals of Sennacherib, found in his palace, he was not more than one year in Judæa.

Sabbatical Years and Jubilees.

B.C.		
39	3	Antigonus.
8	4	
7	5	Herod the
6	1	Great.*
5	2	
4	3	
3	4	
2	5	
1	6	Battle of Actium. Sept. 2, 31.
30	7	
29	8	
8	9	
7	10	
6	11	
5	12	
4	13	
3	14	
2	15	
1	16	
20	17	
19	18	Herod proposes to build the temple.
8	19	Herod begins to build the temple.
7	20	
6	21	
5	22	
4	23	
3	24	
2	25	
1	26	
10	27	
9	28	
8	29	
7	30	
6	31	
5	32	
4	33	
3	34	Birth of Christ.†
2		
1		Death of Herod.‡

* The thirty-four years' reign of Herod counted from the death of Antigonus some months after the taking of Jerusalem. † According to Clem. Alex. Ireneus, Eusebius, Epiphanius, Jerome, Orosius, Cassiodorus. ‡ Herod dies in Feb. B.C. 1, nearly two months after the lunar eclipse of 10 Jan. Josephus assigns 34 whole years to Herod. He reigned nearly 35 years.

consecrated years then present, according to the law. The precision of the dates, and the exactness of agreement of the two computed years of rest with the words of Scripture, is truly remarkable.

But if Demetrius has thus established that the fourteenth year of Hezekiah, B.C. 689-8, was Sabbatical, he has also by inference established that the fifteenth year of Asa, B.C. 920-19, and the third year of Jehosaphat, B.C. 892-1, were Sabbatical as set down in the calendar. Now, "Moses commanded them, saying, At the end of every seven years, in the solemnity of the year of release, in the Feast of Tabernacles, when all Israel is come to appear before the Lord thy God in the place which He shall choose, thou shalt read this law before all Israel in their hearing."* And this reading and proclamation of the law is exactly what appears to have been performed in the two years just mentioned; for, although we read nothing concerning the celebration of the Feast of Tabernacles, which more probably was neglected than observed in those perverse and unworthy times, we do find that in the fifteenth year of Asa, in the third month, before the close of the computed Sabbatical year B.C. 920-19, when, "after a long season, Israel had been without the true God, and without a teaching priest, and without law"—"they entered into a covenant to seek the Lord God of their fathers with all their heart and with all their soul."† At this time, therefore, the law must have been "read before all Israel in their hearing."

Again, in the third year of Jehosaphat, that is in the second half of the computed Sabbatical year, B.C. 892-1, thus confirmed by Demetrius, that prince commanded the princes and Levites to travel throughout the land, taking with them the book of the law, and accordingly they "went throughout all the cities of Judah, and taught the people."‡

Again, in the thirteenth year of Josiah, that is, in the course of the second half of the Sabbatical year B.C. 605-4, in the autumn probably of the latter of these two years, there occurred a remarkable preaching of the law. For in that

* Deut. xxxi. 10.

+ 2 Chron. xv. 10.

‡ 2 Chron. xvii.

Sabbatical Years and Jubilees.

A.D.		
1	Augustus.	
3		
2		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14	1 Tiberius.	
15	2	
16	3	
17	4	
18	5	
19	6	
20	7	
21	8	
22	9	
23	10	
24	11	
25	12	
26	13	
27	14	
28	15	Jesus Christ baptized, being about 30 years old.
29	16	
30	17	
31	18	
32	19	Death of Christ.
33		
34		
35		
36		
37		
38		
39		
40		

year the prophet Jeremiah commenced his forty years of warning to the people of Jerusalem, which ended in the destruction of the city:* and that this preaching began about the time of "the solemnity of the year of release," that is, during that Feast of Tabernacles which immediately followed the completion of the Sabbatical year, may reasonably be inferred from the figurative allusion by the prophet to the then actual state of fallow, or of ordained fallow, and to the seed-time and cultivation which should then be about to commence. "Thus saith the Lord to the men of Judah and Jerusalem, Break up your fallow ground, and sow not amongst thorns. Circumcise yourselves to the Lord,"† &c. It can hardly be doubted that it was the seed-time and breaking-up of fallow, at the end of the seventh year then present to the minds of his hearers, which gave rise to this expression; for although the observance of the Sabbatical year, we know, was neglected by the mass of the nation, in open defiance of the law, we are yet justified in assuming that some few at least were united with Jeremiah, and Hilkiah the high-priest, and the pious king Josiah, in their zealous endeavour at that time to revive the observance of the Mosaic ordinances and ceremonies.

Thus, in addition to the three Sabbatical years recorded by Josephus, and the Sabbatical year in the second year of the reign of Darius, already ascertained—making together four well-defined years of Sabbath after the Captivity—we have other four Sabbatical years before the Captivity, one of which is historically fixed, and the other three marked out by events appropriate specially to the close of the consecrated year, the dates of which are defined with equal precision; and as the intervals between these eight fixed periods are divisible by seven, the inference is unquestionable, that, from the reign of Solomon to the birth of Christ, the Sabbatical years were computed in unbroken series, without intercalation.

We have now cleared the way for a full understanding of the manner in which the year of Jubilee was computed, and

* Jer. xxv. 3; Ezek. iv. 6.

† Jer. iv. 3, 4.

*Continuation of Ezra's era of Sabbatical Years ending in the
Year of Jubilee of Jubilees, A.D. 1917.*

A.D. 40-41	313-314	586-587	859-860
47-48	320-321	593-594	866-867
54-55	327-328	600-601	873-874
61-62	334-335	607-608	880-881
68-69*	341-342	614-615	887-888
75-76	348-349	621-622	894-895
82-83	355-356	628-629	901-902
89-90	362-363	635-636	908-909
96-97	369-370	642-643	915-916
103-104	376-377	649-650	922-923
110-111	383-384	656-657	929-930
117-118	390-391	663-664	936-937
124-125	397-398	670-671	943-944
131-132	404-405	677-678	950-951
138-139	411-412	684-685	957-958
145-146	418-419	691-692	964-965
152-153	425-426	698-699	971-972
159-160	432-433	705-706	978-979
166-167	439-440	712-713	985-986
173-174	446-447	719-720	992-993
180-181	453-454	726-727	999-1000
187-188	460-461	733-734	1006-1007
194-195	467-468	740-741	1013-1014
201-202	474-475	747-748	1020-1021
208-209	481-482	754-755	1027-1028
215-216	488-489	761-762	1034-1035
222-223	495-496	768-769	1041-1042
229-230	502-503	775-776	1048-1049
236-237	509-510	782-783	1055-1056
243-244	516-517	789-790	1062-1063
250-251	523-524	796-797	1069-1070
257-258	530-531	803-804	1076-1077
264-265	537-538	810-811	1083-1084
271-272	544-545	817-818	1090-1091
278-279	551-552	824-825	1097-1098
285-286	558-559	831-832	1104-1105
292-293	565-566	838-839	1111-1112
299-300	572-573	845-846	1118-1119
306-307	579-580	852-853	1125-1126

are prepared to decide between five different modes of interpretation of this peculiar ordinance which have been suggested by different commentators.

1st. We may dismiss with few words, as already sufficiently considered, the idea that the year of Jubilee, or fiftieth year, was intercalated between the end of the seventh Sabbatical year and the beginning of the next period of seven weeks of years; for if, as we have shown, the Sabbatical years were reckoned in continuous septennial series, intercalation of course was impossible.

2nd. The idea of some that the Sabbatical years were reckoned in septennial series, but that the Jubilees were reckoned at intervals of fifty years in succession—thus disconnecting the Jubilee from the Sabbatical year—is untenable, because it is written, “The space of seven Sabbaths of years shall be unto thee forty-and-nine years. Then shalt thou cause the trumpet of the Jubilee to sound.” So that the Jubilee must always have marked the close of the Sabbatical year, and so have been connected with it.

3rd. The idea of others, that the Sabbatical years were counted from Nisan to Nisan, and were concurrent with the ecclesiastical year, while the Jubilee was counted from Tisri to Tisri, with the civil year, is equally untenable, as disconnecting the sounding of the trumpet of the Jubilee in the seventh month with the closing of the seventh year.

There are but two modes of interpretation which are worthy of serious consideration, viz. :—

4th. That which identifies the year of Jubilee with the forty-ninth year—an opinion which, as we have seen, has the support of many writers of great name;* and,

5th. That which identifies the Jubilee, or fallow year, with the first of the six years of cultivation which followed the Sabbatical year.

This latter interpretation, though at first sight paradoxical, we conceive to be the only true one. Against it, it is urged, with an appearance of great force of reason, that no wise

* See p. 254.

*Continuation of Ezra's era of Sabbatical Years ending in the
Year of Jubilee of Jubilees, A.D. 1917.*

A.D.			
1132-1133	1328-1329	1524-1525	1720-1721
1139-1140	1335-1336	1531-1532	1727-1728
1146-1147	1342-1343	1538-1539	1734-1735
1153-1154	1349-1350	1545-1546	1741-1742
1160-1161	1356-1357	1552-1553	1748-1749
1167-1168	1363-1364	1559-1560	1755-1756
1174-1175*	1370-1371	1566-1567	1762-1763
1181-1182	1377-1378	1573-1574	1769-1770
1188-1189*	1384-1385	1580-1581	1776-1777
1195-1196	1391-1392	1587-1588	1783-1784
1202-1203	1398-1399	1594-1595	1790-1791
1209-1210	1405-1406	1601-1602	1797-1798
1216-1217	1412-1413	1608-1609	1804-1805
1223-1224	1419-1420	1615-1616	1811-1812
1230-1231	1426-1427	1622-1623	1818-1819
1237-1238	1433-1434	1629-1630	1825-1826
1244-1245	1440-1441	1636-1637	1832-1833
1251-1252	1447-1448	1643-1644	1839-1840
1258-1259	1454-1455	1650-1651	1846-1847
1265-1266	1461-1462	1657-1658	1853-1854
1272-1273	1468-1469	1664-1665	1860-1861
1279-1280	1475-1476	1671-1672	1867-1868
1286-1287	1482-1483	1678-1679	1874-1875
1293-1294	1489-1490	1685-1686	1881-1882
1300-1301	1496-1497	1692-1693	1888-1889
1307-1308	1503-1504	1699-1700	1895-1896
1314-1315	1510-1511	1706-1707	1902-1903
1321-1322	1517-1518	1713-1714	1909-1910
Sabbatical year preceding the year of Jubilee			1916-1917

* Dr. Zuchermann's Treatise on the Sabbatical Cycle and Jubilee, p. 55.
Trans. Chron. Inst. vol. iii.

JUBILEE OF JUBILEES, A.D. 1917-18.

Blessed is he that waiteth and cometh to the thousand two
hundred and five and thirty days.

A.D. 1961.

legislator could have entertained the idea of compelling a whole nation to abstain from raising the means of subsistence for two successive years; and also that it is contrary to the terms of the law to suppose that a year of fallow could be concurrent with a year of cultivation: so that the only alternative left, as is assumed, is to identify the Jubilee with the forty-ninth year. Both these objections, we submit, originate simply in a misunderstanding of the law.

At the close of the forty-ninth or Sabbatical year, on the tenth day of the seventh month, the trumpet of the Jubilee was to sound; and on that very day, with the sounding of the trumpet, every bondman became free to return to his family—every man to return to his own possession. Thus far, then, the Jubilee was identical with the year of release,* or Sabbatical year. The sole object of the institution was the recovery of freedom, and of alienated lands: and this object was completed on the day of Atonement which followed the completion of the forty-ninth year. The fallow of the land ordained in the fiftieth year was, we submit, restricted to those few only who, during the past forty-nine years, had been compelled, by poverty, or otherwise, to alienate their property: and to these only were addressed the joyful words, —“It shall be a jubilee unto you, and ye shall return every man unto his possession:” “A Jubilee shall that fiftieth year be unto you, ye shall not sow, neither reap that which groweth of itself,” &c. Where is the necessity for applying these words, as is assumed in the objection, to all occupiers of land throughout the nation? The proclamation of “liberty throughout the land unto all the inhabitants thereof,” had reference only to those who had been in bondage: and in the same manner these words seem to be restricted to those only who regained possession of their land, and who, therefore, as a mark of gratitude, were called upon to offer up the first-fruits of their recovered property, by allowing the land to lie

* The year of release was commanded to be observed by Ezra. (Neh. x. 1.) Maimonides tells us that slaves gave themselves up to revelry and rejoicing for several days before the day of atonement—as during the Roman saturnalia.

fallow, keeping a Sabbath unto the Lord, with its spontaneous produce free to all, to be gathered in the field. Under the law, thus interpreted, no fear of scarcity could arise from the non-cultivation of the few portions of regained land thus required to lie fallow in the second year; while, at the same time, the fiftieth year of fallow ordained for the few, might, without contradiction, be commensurate with the first year of cultivation ordained for the many. Philo, in his treatise on Humanity, does indeed say that the breeders of cattle took the liberty, in the year of Jubilee, of sending their cattle to feed on the most fertile plains, and that this license was not interfered with by the rich owners of the land. But this would seem to have been a practice somewhat beside the law, unless, indeed, the permission here spoken of was given by owners of lands recovered in the year of Jubilee. For Maimonides, as we shall see, tells us distinctly that the observance of the year of Jubilee was not enforced under the second temple.

We are confirmed in the correctness of this view of the interpretation of the law, by the fact, that, with reference to apprehended scarcity arising from non-cultivation in the seventh year, the question is raised, and answered, "What shall we eat in the seventh year?"* But no such question is raised, or even hinted at, with reference to the two supposed successive years of general fallow, in the forty-ninth and fiftieth years, involving much more serious cause for alarm. The just inference is, that in the mind of the law-giver no cause for apprehension was anticipated in the strict performance of the law of the Sabbatical year followed by the Jubilee, beyond what had already been disposed of and provided for in the words, "I will command my blessing upon you in the sixth year, and it shall bring forth fruit for three years, *and ye shall sow the eighth year*;"† which words can have no possible reference, except to the fallow of the seventh year; for the Jubilee, we are told, was the fiftieth year, and so, therefore, identical with the eighth, or first year of cultivation.

* Lev. xxv. 20.

† Lev. xxv. 21, 22.

Our opinion, therefore, is distinct, that the fulfilment of the Jubilee was complete, as regarded the nation in general, at the termination of the forty-ninth year, and that it was computed accordingly at intervals of forty-nine years—that the fiftieth, not the forty-ninth, was the year of Jubilee, to be observed as a year of fallow by those only who regained possession of land in that year—and that the year of Jubilee was commensurate with the first year of cultivation which followed immediately after the Sabbatical year.

And this, again, is the tradition preserved by Maimonides, as regards the mode of computation after the captivity, who writes, “After the destruction of the first temple the computation” (of Sabbatical years and Jubilees) “perished, because it was abolished” (that is, because it could no longer be observed): “the land then remained desolate for seventy years, after which the second temple was built, which lasted 420 years.* In the seventh year from the building” (which might be either the year B.C. 486, or 479, in our reckoning counted either from the commencement or the finishing of the building) “Ezra returned and restored the computation a second time. From that year, therefore, they began to reckon another Sabbatical era, *and constituted the thirteenth year of the second temple* (B.C. 479) *Sabbatical*. They numbered from thence seven Sabbaths, and consecrated the fiftieth year. For, although the Jubilee was not celebrated under the second temple, yet the computation and consecration of the Sabbatical years was preserved:” and again, “The forty-ninth year was Sabbatical, the fiftieth the year of Jubilee: the fiftieth and last year, however, was the first of the six years of the Sabbatical week: and so on for each successive Jubilee.”†

Counting then, according to this rule of computation, from the year B.C. 1423, when the land was divided amongst

* No heed need be given to this computation of 420 years. The traditional interpretation put upon the book of Ezra, however, is valuable.

† Maimonides de Schemittah et Jubileo. Vorst's translation in Gantz Chronology, p. 211.

the tribes by Joshua,—Caleb, who was forty when he first searched the land, then being in the eighty-sixth year of his age,*—we find that the year B.C. 982-1, in which Solomon dedicated the temple of Jerusalem, was a year of Jubilee—that the year B.C. 688-7, or fifteenth year of Hezekiah, was a year of Jubilee, as already determined—and that the year B.C. 492-1, or the year when the building of the second temple was commenced, was also a year of Jubilee. And, as regards this latter date, this is the tradition preserved by Rabbi Eliezer, one of the earliest of Jewish writers extant, some say contemporary with Gamaliel, the teacher of St. Paul,† in the first century A.D., others placing him as late as the fourth century. “Ezra, Jerubbabel the son of Schealtiel, and Jeshua the son of Jehotzedek,” writes Eliezer, “went up from Babylon, and began to lament in the temple of the Lord”—“the Samaritans came against them in battle, 180,000 men.‡ But how Samaritans? were they not Cuthceans? called Samaritans, however, from the name of the city of Samaria. They also endeavour to slay Nehemiah, as it is said, ‘Come, and let us consult together in the villages,’ &c. Moreover, before that they impeded the work of God (that is, the restoration of the temple) for two years, *even to the year of Jubilee.*”§

We now proceed to show how the calendar of Sabbatical years and Jubilees may be applied in illustration of the third period of the Jewish Church, or 490 years from Darius to the birth of Christ; and how the obvious reference in the ninth chapter of the book of Daniel to a series of Sabbatical years, hitherto an insuperable stumbling-block in the way of interpreters, is, on our principle of reckoning, made plain, so that he who runs may read.

We have observed that the words of Daniel in this chapter, “Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people and upon thy holy city,” were accomplished on the termination of the last of the seventy penitential Sabbaths, which were ful-

* Josh. xiv. 7-10.

† Vorst's Preface.

‡ An instance of Oriental tendency to exaggerate numbers.

§ Pirke, R. Eliezer. Vorst's translation, p. 101.

filled during the desolation of Jerusalem, ending in the second year of Darius, and that the words were so understood by Daniel himself, as containing a direct and special answer to his petition for the restoration of Jerusalem, concerning which he had so fervently prayed. Nevertheless, if there be truth in our reckoning, no one can fail to perceive that these same words may have been intended to cover a hidden and more mysterious meaning, referable to seventy weeks of years yet again to be accomplished on the people and the holy city, terminating, as the event has proved, in the anointing of the "Most Holy," the heir to the throne of David, "Messiah the Prince," the Holy One of Israel.* So that, whether the words of the prophet be interpreted prospectively or retrospectively, they were literally fulfilled in the accomplishment of 490 years, or seventy Sabbatical weeks, as registered in the calendar.

Thus far the interpretation of the words of Daniel is plain and without difficulty. The difficulty which has ever existed, and which will continue to exist, in connexion with the common Biblical reckoning, is, how to interpret the following words,—“Know, therefore, and understand, that from the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem unto Messiah the Prince, *shall be seven weeks and threescore and two weeks*: the street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times. And after *threescore and two weeks* shall Messiah be cut off,” &c. The repetition of the term, “threescore and two weeks,” marks it as a defined period not to be passed over without separate interpretation. While the period of “seven weeks” is one of marked significance in connexion with the Sabbatical cycles. Nevertheless, in most modern explanations of the prophecy, these precise terms are left without any attempt at explanation, and the common notion is, that “seven weeks, and sixty-two weeks,” is merely a mode of expressing a period of sixty-nine weeks: and in one mode or other, sixty-nine weeks are made to terminate either with the death or ministry of Jesus Christ,

* Aben-Esra and Abarbenel both apply the words “holy of holies” to Messiah.

But this arrangement merely passes over the difficulty of the problem without solution. Others, such as Pontanus, Cuninghame,* and Sir I. Newton, clearly recognise the Jubilaic period in the words, "seven weeks;" and the first of these interpreters proposes to reckon the whole period as sixty-two weeks, and seven weeks,† thus reversing the order of the weeks and Jubilee, as placed by the prophet, and placing the birth of Christ in a year of Jubilee: while Newton, to escape the difficulty, suggests that the "seven weeks," or period of Jubilee, form a separate period, terminating in the second coming of the Messiah. These two arrangements are both contradictory of the words which place the coming of "Messiah the Prince," at the expiration of sixty-two weeks, *not in the year of Jubilee*. All this is highly unsatisfactory, and merely illustrates the great difficulty, and, indeed, impossibility, of reconciling the weeks of Daniel with the calendar of weeks and Jubilees, in conformity with the common reckoning of Biblical chronology. This conclusion was so obvious to Prideaux, that, in one of the most masterly treatises on the connexion of sacred and profane history yet written, he boldly dismisses as erroneous the idea that Daniel has made any reference whatever in this prophecy to actual Sabbatical weeks. Prideaux, in the preface to his great work, writes, "I have in the series of this history taken no notice either of the Jubilee or the Sabbatical years of the Jews, both because of the uselessness, and also uncertainty of them. They are useless, because they help not to the explaining of anything either in the Holy Scriptures, or the histories of the times which we treat of: and they are uncertain, because it doth not appear when or how they were observed:"‡ and again, "They act most out of the way in this matter, who would confine Daniel's prophecy of the seventy weeks to so many Shemittahs as if these

* "Synopsis of Chronology," p. 169. Ussher computes from his supposed 20th of Artaxerxes, B.C. 454, which is not even Sabbatical. Petavius from one year higher. Prideaux and Greswell from B.C. 458, Newton from 457; both Sabbatical, but not Jubilaic. Marshall from B.C. 445, counting in years of 360 days each.

† Pontanus, "Chron. de Sab.," p. 147.

‡ Prideaux's Connec.: Pref. p. xvi.

seventy weeks fell in exactly with seventy Shemittahs that the first week began with the first year of a Shemittah, or Sabbatical week, and ended with a Sabbatical year, and so all the rest down to the last of the whole number: and to this end some have perplexed themselves in vain to find out Sabbatical years to suit their hypotheses, and fix them to times to which they did never belong: whereas the prophecy means no more than by the seventy weeks to express seventy times seven years, that is 490 in the whole, without any relation to Shemittahs, or Sabbatical years." * It is needless to say that we entirely dissent from those observations. Far more to the purpose, in our opinion, are the words of the illustrious Newton, who remarks, "I content myself with observing, that, as the seventy, and sixty-two weeks, were Jewish weeks, ending with Sabbatical years: so the *seven weeks are the compass of a Jubilee*, and begin and end with actions proper for a Jubilee." †

It is interesting to observe the working of the mind of the great philosopher under the difficulties of this question; for it is certain that he has laid down with truth and exactness some novel points of chronology and interpretation, which, if he had carried them to their just conclusions, would have led him clearly to the solution of the problem. Yet, being unable to free himself from the fetters of the received chronology, it would seem that he has been driven to reject the legitimate results of his own sagacious reasoning, and to falsify historical facts worked out with much labour and ingenuity.

1st. As an astronomer, Newton adhered to the leading date B.C. 585, as that of the eclipse of Thales: in which conclusion he has been confirmed, as we have seen, by the accurate calculations of modern astronomy.

2nd. He alone, of all interpreters, has identified "Darius, the son of Ahasuerus, of the seed of the Medes," with Darius son or successor of Ahasuerus, or Cyaxares II., whose father, Astyages, married in the year of the eclipse B.C. 585: the necessary conclusion from which is, that as Darius "took the

* Prideaux's Connec. : Pref. p. xix.

† Sir I. Newton, on Daniel, &c., p. 133.

kingdom" (whatever that expression may signify) when about sixty-two years of age, that event could not have taken place less than about eighty or ninety years after his grandfather's marriage in 585, or, at any rate, till long after Darius the son of Hystaspes had been upon the throne. And since two mighty kings, bearing the same title, cannot be supposed to have been ruling at the same time over the same dominions, the identity of Darius the Mede with Darius son of Hystaspes is the only just result. And again, if this identification be correct, then must this king have taken "the kingdom" in the sixty-second year of his age, that is, in B.C. 493.

3rd. Newton alone, of all interpreters, has pointed out that the completion of the wall of Jerusalem by Nehemiah the son of Hachaliah took place, as Josephus has related, in the twenty-eighth year of Artaxerxes Longimanus,* in the year B.C. 437, that is to say, about sixty-two Sabbatical weeks before the birth of Christ.

4th. He alone has truly, as we believe, interpreted the "seven weeks" and "threescore and two weeks" of Daniel, "unto Messiah," as signifying *a period of Jubilee*, and sixty-two Sabbatical weeks, ending with the birth of Christ, B.C. 3-2: the direct inference from which is that these weeks must have commenced in B.C. 885, and that a period of Jubilee was completed in B.C. 436.

5th. By a searching and acute analysis of the books of Ezra and Nehemiah, Newton alone, of all interpreters, has pointed out that Nehemiah, the son of Hachaliah, was the contemporary and companion of Zerubbabel, and also of certain priests who came up with Zerubbabel, who sealed the covenant with Ezra after his return to Jerusalem:† the result of which discovery is, to place the sealing of that covenant, and the contemporaneous events, not earlier than between fifty and sixty years before the death of Nehemiah, or somewhere about the years B.C. 480 or 490; for Nehemiah was alive in the

* In our copies of Josephus it is written twenty-eighth year of Xerxes, but this is clearly incorrect: Xerxes did not reign thirty-two years.—Nehem. v. 14.

† Nehem. xii. 1-8; x. 1-9.

thirty-second year of Artaxerxes, B.C. 433, and lived probably as late as the year B.C. 430.

6th. Lastly, with Prideaux, he truly considered that "the dispersed Jews became a people and city, when they first returned into a polity or body politic in the time of Ezra."* And if his inference be correct, that Ezra sealed the covenant with the priests who returned with Zerubbabel, then the just conclusion is, that the king in whose seventh year Ezra returned, who is called Artaxerxes, was in fact no other than Xerxes.

In these six propositions it would appear that Newton has, in fact, solved the difficulties of this perplexing, though plainly uttered prophecy, the sacred problem, which has baffled interpretation from the days of Clemens of Alexandria, and Africanus to the present time; and it is difficult to believe that Newton could have been unconscious of the direct conclusions derivable from his own statement of facts. Being bound, however, in the chains of a conventional chronology,

* Observations on Daniel, p. 131. The Peloponnesian war began in spring (An. 1, Olymp. 87), as Diodorus, Eusebius, and all other authors agree. It began two months before Pythodorus ceased to be Archon (Thucyd. 1. ii.), that is, in April, two months before the end of the Olympic year. Now, the years of this war are most certainly determined by the 50 years' distance of its first year, from the transit of Xerxes inclusively (Thucyd. 1. ii.), or 48 years exclusively (Eratosth. apud Clem. Alex.), by the 69 years' distance of its end, or the 27th year from the beginning of Alexander's reign in Greece, by the acting of the Olympic games in its 4th and 12th years (Thucyd. 1. v.), and by three eclipses of the sun and one of the moon, mentioned by Thucydides and Xenophon. Now Thucydides, an unquestionable witness, tells us that the news of the death of Artaxerxes Longimanus was brought to Ephesus, and from thence by some Athenians to Athens in the 7th year of the Peloponnesian war, when the winter half year was running, and therefore he died (An. 4, Olymp. 88) in the end of An. J. P. 4289 (B.C. 425), suppose a month or two before mid-winter, for so long the news would be in coming. Now, Artaxerxes Longimanus reigned 40 years by the consent of Diodorus, Eusebius, Jerome, Sulpicius, or 41, according to Ptolemy's Canon, Clem. Alex. 1. 1, Strom., Chron. Alex., Abulpharagius. Nicephorus, including therein the reigns of his successors, Xerxes and Sogdian, as Abulpharagius informs us. After Artaxerxes reigned his son Xerxes two months, and Sogdian seven months; but their reign is not reckoned apart in summing up the years of the kings, but is included in the 40 or 41 years' reign of Artaxerxes. Omit these nine months, and the precise reign of Artaxerxes will leave 39 years and 3 months. And, therefore, since his reign ended in the beginning of winter, An. J. P. 4289, it began between midsummer and autumn, An. J. P. 4250, B.C. 464.—(Newton, on Daniel, p. 139.)

which rests, indeed, upon the-authority of the most charming and truthful of historians, but the most loose and untrustworthy of chronologists, he has been content to abandon the advanced and tenable position to which he had virtually attained, and to allow himself to be diverted into a series of untenable conclusions, unworthy of his reputation, at variance with his premises, and into which no one has since found any inclination to follow him.

The eclipse which Herodotus distinctly places in the reign of Cyaxares I., the father of Astyages, he has, in contradiction of all authority, placed in the reign of Cyaxares II., the son of Astyages. The "seven weeks," so truly declared by him to represent "the compass of a Jubilee," he refers, as before said, to the time of the second coming of Christ. The sealing of the covenant by Nehemiah, together with Ezra and the priests, who came up with Zerubbabel, he places in the year B.C. 536, in the reign of Cyrus, instead of the year B.C. 479, or 7th year of Xerxes, thus leading to the most improbable inference that Nehemiah and Ezra must have both lived to the age of about 120 years. And he suggests that Darius the son of Ahasuerus, the mighty ruler over 120 provinces of the Persian empire, was a prince unknown in secular history, or monumental records, and nowhere alluded to, except in the Book of Daniel.

Now, when did the command—"to restore and to build Jerusalem"—go forth? Clearly at the time, when the Jews were permitted to re-establish themselves as a body politic, and when the Jewish laws and institutions, both secular and ecclesiastical, were revived at Jerusalem. This, indeed, was not fully effected till the return of Ezra in the 7th year of Artaxerxes (Xerxes), B.C. 479; but the computation of the times of the "holy city" commenced seven years earlier, on the completion and dedication of the temple in B.C. 486-7; and from that date they began to reconstruct all that had been in abeyance during their captivity, and to compute the new reckoning of the year of Jubilee, as applicable to the restitution of alienated lands. The command to build Jerusalem was a

command from God, and had no reference to the decrees of the kings of Persia; and that command was given at the time of the completion of the new temple. The first words of the prophecy itself, as already interpreted, lead to this conclusion. For the seventy weeks determined upon the "holy city," as we have seen, were reckoned by the heavenly messenger, not from the capture of Jerusalem by David, but from the date of the dedication of the temple by Solomon. Jerusalem had long before become the seat of the throne of David, and the tabernacle and the ark of the covenant had long before the time of Solomon been brought up to the city; yet, not till the consecration of the temple did the times of the "holy city" begin to be reckoned. So, again, though many of the Jews had returned to Jerusalem in the reign of Cyrus, and though, no doubt, a tabernacle and altar had been set up for the celebration of the temple-worship immediately after their return, yet the holy city was not complete till the dedication of the temple in the sixth or seventh year of Darius, from which time the years of Jubilee were again to be reckoned. The completion of the temple is spoken of by Ezra in these emphatic words, as marking the importance of the epoch: "And they builded and finished it, according to the *commandment of the God of Israel*, and according to the commandment of Cyrus, and Darius, and Artaxerxes, king of Persia."* Josephus, also, very clearly marks this as the time of the re-establishment of the government in the hands of native rulers. Speaking of the great passover, which was celebrated at the time of the dedication, he writes: "They performed sacrifices of thanksgiving, because God had led them again to the land of their fathers, and to the laws thereto belonging, and had rendered the mind of the King of Persia favourable to them. So these men offered the largest sacrifices on these accounts, and used

* Ezra, vi. 14. In the book of Esdras we read, "And they finished these things by the *commandment* of the Lord God of Israel, and with the *consent* of Cyrus, Darius, and Artaxerxes, kings of Persia." vii. 4, Διὰ προστάγματος τοῦ κυρίου θεοῦ Ἰσραὴλ, καὶ μετὰ τῆς γνώμης Κυρίου, &c. Josephus writes, κατὰ τὰ προστάγματα τοῦ θεοῦ Ἰσραὴλ καὶ μετὰ τῆς γνώμης Κυρίου.

great magnificence in the worship of God, and dwelt in Jerusalem, *and made use of a form of government that was aristocratical, but mixed with an oligarchy, for the high-priests were at the head of these affairs*, until the posterity of the Asmoneans set up kingly government."*

The solution of the words of the prophecy, in conformity with the calendar of Sabbatical years and jubilees, stands, therefore, simply thus:—

1. The command to restore the temple, or sanctuary, went forth by the mouth of Haggai and Zechariah in the second year of Darius, in the year of Jubilee B.C. 492, seventy weeks before the birth of Christ.

2. The command to restore and to build Jerusalem, that is, the figurative "holy city," was the command given by the Lord God of heaven to Cyrus, which was re-promulgated and carried into effect in the sixth year of Darius, that is, in the year B.C. 487 or 486, at the time of the dedication of the second temple, sixty-nine weeks before the birth of Christ.

3. The wall of Jerusalem was dedicated by Nehemiah, "in troublous times," after the expiration of "seven weeks," counting from the dedication of the temple, in the year of Jubilee B.C. 436, or 29th of Artaxerxes Longimanus; which year of Jubilee is marked also by the examination of the genealogical registers in that year, and the consecration of the city wall, which was one of the necessary ceremonies of the year of Jubilee.†

4. The birth of Christ took place in the autumn or winter of B.C. 3, in the beginning of the Sabbatical year, after "three-score and two weeks," counted from the dedication of the wall.

Thus far, then, as regards the Sabbatical years and Jubilees, and their use in illustration of the times of the Jewish

* Whiston's Josephus, Ant. xi, v. 7.

† "As in the days of Joshua they were bound to pay tithes, to observe the years of remission, and the jubilees, and also the walled cities were sanctified, so at the entrance in the time of Ezra they were bound by the laws to pay tithes, to observe the years of remission, and the jubilees, and they also sanctified their walled cities." (Seder Olam, ch. xxx.) According to the opinion of Michaelis and Ewald, the tables of genealogies were corrected and filled up in the year of Jubilee. See Smith's Dictionary, *voce* Jubilee.

kingdom and commonwealth ; and considering that the septennial division of time is one of the peculiar characteristics of sacred history, even from the first six days or periods of creation and supplemental Sabbath, down to the sounding of the seventh and final trumpet of the Apocalypse, and that the peculiar reckoning by weeks of years was a special ordinance of God to the Jewish nation, let no one hereafter, taking up the subject of Daniel's weeks,—the one single occasion when weeks of years are spoken of in the Bible after the time of Joshua,—allow himself to be persuaded that the Sabbatical years and Jubilees “are useless, because they help not to the explaining anything in the Holy Scriptures,” or that “they act most out of the way who would confine Daniel's prophecy of the ‘seventy weeks’ to so many shemittahs, as if these seventy weeks fell in exactly with seventy shemittahs,” each ending with a Sabbatical year.

Before we close these remarks, it is necessary to offer a few words in explanation of one of the principal features of this interpretation. How, it may be asked, are we to believe that Ezra returned to Jerusalem in the year B.C. 479, when he tells us himself that he received his commission in the seventh year of Artaxerxes, which year, according to our own reckoning, would appear to be B.C. 458 ?

With regard to this question, we read in the book of Ezra, “Now after these things,” that is to say, after the repair and dedication of the Temple,—described by Haggai as lying “waste” in the second year of Darius,—“in the reign of Artaxerxes, king of Persia,” “Ezra went up from Babylon,” “and he came to Jerusalem in the fifth month, which was in the seventh year of the king.” (Ezra, vii. 1-7.)

According to the common interpretation of the book of Ezra, which assumes that the dedication of the Temple took place in B.C. 516, and the return of Ezra in B.C. 458 : Ezra is here supposed to declare that he came to Jerusalem fifty-eight years after the repair of the desolations of the Temple, and the history of the Jews is thus left blank during that long period. This, however, must be a false interpretation of the passage.

For what does Ezra say in his prayer immediately after his return? "Our God hath not forsaken us in our bondage, but hath extended mercy unto us in the sight of the *kings* of Persia" (Darius and Artaxerxes, who had just commanded the Temple to be built), "to give us a reviving, *to set up the house of our God, and to repair the desolations thereof.*" It is not reasonable to assume, either that Ezra is here referring to a setting up of the house of God, and to desolations which had been repaired fifty-eight years before his time, or that so long an interval could have elapsed without producing some event in connexion with the Temple, worthy of record in his history. He is evidently appealing to things present both to the eyes and hearts of his hearers, and when he tells us that "after these things" he returned to Jerusalem, alluding to the repairs of the Temple, he clearly points out the time of his return as not long after the completion of those repairs. The writer of the Seder Olam, Maimonides, David Gantz, and all the Jewish writers support this interpretation, affirming that he came up in the seventh year of the second Temple, which, counted from the completion of the building, was B.C. 479, or the seventh year of Xerxes. So that when Ezra styles this king Artaxerxes, he is in fact speaking of the king commonly known in secular history as Xerxes.* This is not only the opinion and tradition of the Talmud and of modern Jews, but was also the tradition and opinion in the days of Josephus, who, in his history of the Wars,† speaks of the return of the Jews from Babylon in the reign of Xerxes, and in the Antiquities writes, "On the death of Darius, Xerxes, his son, took the kingdom;" "Now about this time a son of Joshua, whose name was Joachim, was the high-priest. Moreover, there was now in Babylon a righteous man, and one that enjoyed a great reputation among the multitude. He was the principal priest of the people, and his name was Esdras."‡ Josephus then goes on to say that Esdras returned to Jerusalem in the reign of Xerxes, and during the high-priesthood of Joachim, not of

* "Arta," is merely an affix common to many Persian names. It signifies great, according to Herodotus.

† Wars, ii. vi. 2.

‡ Whiston's Josephus, Ant., xi. v. 1.

Eliashib, as commonly supposed. This, again, appears to be confirmed by Nehemiah, who, after giving a list of the priests and Levites who came up with Zerubbabel, writes, "These were in the days of Joiakim, the son of Jeshuah, the son of Jozadak, and in the days of Nehemiah, the governor, and of Ezra the priest, the scribe,"* thus coupling the times of Nehemiah and Ezra, with those of Zerubbabel, who built the temple. This identification of Artaxerxes with Xerxes clears up one of the greatest perplexities in the book of Ezra. For who has not stumbled when endeavouring to interpret the fourth chapter of Ezra, where he speaks of king Artaxerxes,† who obstructed the building of Jerusalem: and who has not wondered at finding Artaxerxes coupled with Darius in the command to build the temple? Jewish commentators infer that Artaxerxes and Darius must, therefore, have been‡ one and the same king. Josephus, who was deeply tainted with the conventional heathen chronology of his day, supposes that Artaxerxes must have been Cambyses. While most modern interpreters would wish us to believe that Smerdis the Magian is the king here referred to. As if Ezra, who was about the court of Persia, was unacquainted with the true titles of the kings he speaks of. But if the temple was finished in the year B.C. 487, or 486, as we have determined, then can there be no question as to who was the Persian king associated with Darius at that time. For Herodotus § tells us that about that very time, that is to say, about four years after the battle of

* Nehem. xii. 26.

† This Artaxerxes is called Ahasuerus, i.e. Xerxes, in the previous verse, in the Hebrew extract. By the Chaldee writer he is called Artaxerxes, his title at a later date. Ezra, iv. 6-8.

‡ "Ezras scriba ascendit à Babel Hierosolymam cumque ipso captivitas anno septimo Artaxerxis, uti conscriptum est in libro Ezræ, cap. vi. Atque ex narratione Seder Olam, cap. 30. Darius ædificavit templum: omnes enim reges Persæ vocabantur Artaxerxes, uti omnes reges Ægypti vocitabantur Pharaones, prout explicabitur, &c. Itaque Ezras non tardavit in terram Israelis ascendere, anno enim sexto absoluta est ædificatio, et anno septimo ex Babel ascendit Hierosolymam. At vero si asseratur, Artaxerxem non fuisse Darium, tum mirum est cur Ezras non ascenderit toto tempore Darii, et integris sex annis Artaxerxis. Sed planum est hunc *Darium fuisse Artaxerxem*."—"Chron. Sac. Prof.," R. David Gantz, p. 56.

|| Herod. vii. 2-4.

Marathon, which was fought in the year B.C. 490, Darius declared Xerxes, son of 'Atossa, to be his heir and successor, having at the same time raised him to the throne. (ἀποδέξας δὲ βασιλεῖα Πέρσης Δαρείῳ Ξερξέα.) Plutarch, also, copying from some other historian, relates how, on the decision of Darius, his elder brother made his obeisance, and taking him by the hand led him to the throne. It was, therefore, during that short interval only, before the death of Darius, when Darius and Xerxes were associated together on the throne, that the building of the temple could have been finished.*

But we have observed, that Ezra, who was about the court of Persia, must have been acquainted with the real title of the king who gave him his commission; and if the real title of that king was Xerxes, how does it come to pass that he gives him, on three occasions, the title Artaxerxes? We have always argued that Daniel, when speaking of Darius, his master, could not be pointing to a king known by the title Cyaxares; and Ezra, when speaking of Artaxerxes, could not, as we have just said, have been referring to Cambyzes or Smerdis. How, then, can he be supposed to be referring to Xerxes under this title? The reply to this question we think is satisfactory. There is much reason for believing that Xerxes, or Ahasuerus, towards the latter part of his reign, had assumed the title Artaxerxes, and that it was during the time when he bore the latter title that Ezra wrote his history. We read, in the Septuagint version of the book of Daniel, that "Artaxerxes, of the seed of the Medes, took the kingdom, Darius being full of years, and venerable with old age." On the common supposition that the Darius here spoken of was Cyaxares, these words have always been, and ever will be, inexplicable; but, knowing as we now do, that the son of Hystaspes is the king here referred to by

* "Initium Xerxis cum patre incipientis imperare sumendum ab anno, qui est quintus a clade Marathoniâ, Periodi autem Juliani 4227 = B.C. 487."—Scaliger de Emend. Temp., p. 406. Petavius writes, "Xerxes a patre Dario designatus rex anno exacto tertio post cladem Marathoniam, quod anno circiter Olympiadis 73 secundo contigit, Darii ineunte 35, J. P. 4227." Scaliger we must presume intended to write quartus, not quintus. Both place the accession of Xerxes one year too early. The date was B.C. 486.

Daniel, it is unquestionable that the Artaxerxes who is here declared to have taken the kingdom in the extreme old age of Darius, was no other than Xerxes, and that Xerxes, therefore, was known to the writer of this passage under the title Artaxerxes. Again, Themistocles we know fled from Athens to the court of Persia about the year B.C. 473, or 472, eight or nine years before the accession of Artaxerxes Longimanus, according to the canon of Ptolemy, Diodorus, Eusebius, Jerome, and Sulpicius. Yet Charon of Lampsachus attests that he fled to the court of Artaxerxes; and Thucydides goes so far as to affirm that he fled to Artaxerxes, son of Xerxes. Much controversy has taken place upon this question; and while Ussher, Petavius, Kruger, Hengstenberg, and many others, are inclined to throw back the reign of Artaxerxes Longimanus eight or nine years earlier than the common date, Dodwell, Clinton, and others of equal authority, contend that Themistocles must have arrived in Persia so many years later than would appear from history. Plutarch informs us that Ephorus, Dinon, Clitarchus, and Heraclides, and the greatest number of authorities in his days, represented Themistocles as flying to the court of Xerxes. The only possible way of reconciling these conflicting opinions is by assuming that Xerxes had taken the title Artaxerxes when Themistocles arrived in Persia, and this we believe to be the solution of the difficulty.

We have before argued* that the association of Xerxes with his father Darius may have taken place as early as the year B.C. 494, and that Artaxerxes Longimanus may therefore have begun to reign as early as B.C. 474, or 473: in support of which we have rested much upon an Egyptian monument, on which Dr. Birch seems to think that the 13th year of Xerxes may be represented as concurrent with the 36th of Darius. Libanius also countenances this view, when relating that Darius and Xerxes, united on the throne, made preparation for ten years after the battle of Marathon for the invasion of Greece; † while both Aristotle and Pliny ‡ speak of Darius

* See pp. 22 and 45, *Trans. Chron. Inst.* vol. ii. part 3.

† Ussher's *Annals*, p. 173.

‡ *Ibid.* p. 175.

as alive at the time of that invasion. This mode of computation certainly agrees well with the reckoning of Maimonides, who places Ezra's return in the seventh year of the new temple, which would thus be concurrent also with the seventh year of Xerxes, the 13th year of the new temple being B.C. 479. Pending, however, some further confirmation of this apparent testimony of the monument, we think it safer to adhere to the direct testimony of Herodotus, that it was about the fourth year after the battle of Marathon that Xerxes was appointed king, that is, in B.C. 486, and to reckon that Ezra returned to Jerusalem in the summer of the seventh year of that king's reign, B.C. 479, and that in the autumn of the same year he enforced the observance of the Sabbatical year, being the 13th from the commencement of the temple, as stated by Gantz, the Seder Olam, and Maimonides, and confirmed by the unvarying testimony of the Talmud.

This identification of Artaxerxes, who gave Ezra his commission, with Xerxes, son of Darius, which is so fully borne out by the internal evidence of the book of Ezra, forms a wonderful and exact confirmation of our whole scheme of reckoning. For thus the dedication of the second temple cannot be placed earlier than the year B.C. 486; and thus, therefore, the dates of the whole dynasty of the kings of Judah must be lowered at least to the extent which is required to place it in conformity with that invaluable record of Hebrew chronology, so often referred to—the Canon of Demetrius, the Jewish historian.

LONDON:

STRANGEWAYS AND WALDEN, PRINTERS, 28 Castle St. Leicester Sq.





